

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

Vol. XXVI

JANUARY, 1948

No. 2

ALEXANDER KERENSKY, MINISTER OF WAR
AND MARINE

Sister Angelita

THE HISTORICAL SETTING OF THE MALTHUSIAN THEORY

James R. Irwin

A UNIQUE LIBRARY OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Brendan C. McNally

TOYNBEE'S PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY

Thomas P. Neill

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Saint Louis University

Saint Louis 3, Mo.

\$2.00 a Year

50 cents a copy

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A SERVICE QUARTERLY

for Teachers and Students of History

Vol. XXVI

JANUARY, 1948

No. 2

Editor

JOHN FRANCIS BANNON

Editorial Board

THOMAS L. COONAN

JASPER W. CROSS

ANTHONY F. CZAJKOWSKI

JOSEPH P. DONNELLY

LAURENCE J. KENNY

THOMAS P. NEILL

PAUL G. STEINBICKER

HERBERT WEINSCHL

Published quarterly in November, January, March, and May, by the Department of History, Saint Louis University, Saint Louis 3, Missouri. Entered as second-class matter January 7, 1932, at the Post Office of Saint Louis, Missouri, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Address all communications to THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN, 221 North Grand Blvd., Saint Louis 3, Missouri. THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN is indexed in the CATHOLIC BOOKMAN and THE CATHOLIC PERIODICAL INDEX.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ALEXANDER KERENSKY, MINISTER OF WAR AND MARINE, MAY 18 TO JULY 21, 1917	27
<i>Sister Angelita</i>	
THE HISTORICAL SETTING OF THE MALTHUSIAN THEORY	29
<i>James R. Irwin</i>	
A UNIQUE LIBRARY OF AMERICAN HISTORY	31
<i>Brendan C. McNally</i>	
TOYNBEE'S PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY	33
<i>Thomas P. Neill</i>	
BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES	42

CONTRIBUTORS

SISTER ANGELITA MYERSCOUGH, Ad.PP.S., A. M., is instructor in history, Saint Teresa's Academy, East Saint Louis, Illinois. She did both her undergraduate and graduate work at Saint Louis University.

JAMES R. IRWIN, A.M., is a part-time instructor in the Department of Education, University of Detroit, and is also connected with the Detroit Board of Education.

BRENDAN C. McNALLY, S.J., A. M., is part-time instructor in history, College of the Holy Cross, and is carrying on research at the "unique library of American history" which he describes. He is a candidate for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in history at Saint Louis University.

THOMAS P. NEILL, A.M., Ph.D., is associate professor of history, Saint Louis University. As a frequent contributor to THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN he needs no further introduction.

Alexander Kerensky, Minister of War and Marine

May 18 to July 21, 1917

Sister Angelita

Saint Teresa's Academy

WHEN Alexander Kerensky assumed the portfolio of War and Marine in Russia's Provisional Government, on May 18, 1917, he placed himself in a position which demanded a decisive attitude on the all-important question of the Russian Revolution in 1917: the question of war or peace. The people wanted land and bread, but above all, they wanted peace.¹

All groups striving for influence with the people at this time promised peace. But with respect to the time and manner of its achievement, there were three distinct views. On the extreme left were the Bolsheviki led by Lenin, who insisted on an immediate separate peace with Germany. They were out-and-out "Defeatists."²

On the extreme right were the moderates, chiefly the Cadets, of the Provisional Government. They wished to continue war to a victorious end, in close cooperation with the Allies. The imperialist war aims set up by the tsar were to be retained: Russia must get possession of Constantinople and the Straits. These views were frequently expressed by Foreign Minister P. N. Miliukov, both in statements to the press and to the Allied representatives at Petrograd.³

Midway between these two extremes were the Socialists and influential Soviet leaders. They demanded "peace without annexation and indemnities on the basis of the self-determination of peoples."⁴ They believed that such a peace could be made only by agreement of all the warring powers, and that a separate peace with Germany would be disastrous to Russia and the revolutionary gains. This was the view held by Kerensky and his fellow Socialists.

Through March and April there was conflict between Miliukov, speaking in the name of the imperialist right, and the Soviets,⁵ who issued their appeals to the people and to the Socialists of the whole world. The conflict culminated in the resignation of the moderate leaders, Gutchkov and Miliukov, from the Provisional Government on May 16.

Under the guidance of Kerensky, a new coalition

ministry was formed, which included four Socialist representatives of the Petrograd Soviet.⁶ M. I. Tere-schenko succeeded Miliukov in the Foreign Office and Kerensky himself took the portfolio of War and Marine. While the responsibility for foreign policy would normally have belonged to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, in the abnormal condition of Russia in May 1917, it was inevitable that the responsibility would fall on the the War Minister as well. Formulation of war aims and the control of the army and navy must go together when a nation is in the midst of war and revolution. Accordingly, the new Minister of Foreign Affairs and Kerensky, joined by the other members of the Provisional Government, issued a declaration on May 18:

In matters of foreign policy, the Provisional Government, in harmony with the people, spurns the idea of a separate peace, and proclaims openly that it is its aim to bring about, at the earliest possible date, a general peace . . . without annexations, without indemnities, and on the basis of the self-determination of peoples. . .

Believing that the defeat of Russia and her Allies would not only be the source of the greatest calamity for the people, but would retard and make impossible the conclusion of a general peace on the basis of the above-mentioned principles, the Provisional Government trusts that the Revolutionary Army of Russia will not allow the German troops to crush our Allies in the West, and then turn against us. To strengthen the democratization in our Army, to organize and strengthen its fighting power for both defensive and offensive operations, is the most important task now before the Provisional Government.⁷

This "most important task" became the responsibility of Kerensky as Minister of War and Marine. Before we turn to see what he did to fulfill that task, we shall consider some of the difficulties that faced him in its fulfillment.

First, there were among the civilian population difficulties which affected the military. The old problem of land hunger among the peasants was reflected in the restlessness of the men in the trenches. They feared the land would be divided in their absence, and that they would be left out.

Then there was the difficult political situation that has been termed the "dyarchy."⁸ On the one side was the Provisional Government, the nominal ruling power of the country; on the other was the Soviet system, which had greater actual power. This presented to Kerensky the problem of getting the Soviet to support the government,⁹ and at the same time of lessening

¹ R. H. Bruce Lockhart, *British Agent* (New York, 1933), p. 168.

² Sir George Buchanan, *My Mission to Russia and Other Diplomatic Memories* (London, 1923), II, 139.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 119 and 122.

⁴ Quoted from a proclamation printed in *Izvestia*, May 15, 1917, reprinted in Frank A. Golder, *Documents of Russian History, 1914-1917* (New York, 1927), pp. 340-343.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 320-343; all the important statements issued by both sides are reprinted here.

⁶ James Mavor, *The Russian Revolution* (London, 1928), p. 80.

⁷ From the text in Golder, *op. cit.*, pp. 353-355.

⁸ Boris Souvarine, *Stalin* (New York, 1939), p. 145.

⁹ Although the Soviet was represented in the new Ministry, it continued to exercise great power independent of the Provisional Government.

its influence with the soldiers. As long as the soldiers turned to the Soviet rather than to the government for orders, the government could not formulate a well-integrated military policy with any hope of success.

Another problem was the war-weariness of the nation. Then, there was the general breakdown of discipline and morality among the masses due to "the dismissal of the old police, the general let-down in watchfulness and the growth of poverty."¹⁰ All these were exerting a deteriorating effect on the men at the front.

More immediately to be dealt with by Kerensky were factors in the army which were destructive of its fighting capacity. Among these one of the most serious was the bad feeling between officers and men. We recall how in the early days of the 1917 revolution, the men gave vent to their pent-up feelings of resentment against the brutal discipline of the old regime by mistreatment of their officers. This had continued, and, while some officers who naturally won the esteem of their men were able to retain their influence, others had to suffer many insults.¹² Further to aggravate the problem of authority in the armed ranks were the popularly selected soldiers' committees that had sprung up everywhere and taken authority into their own hands.

Further difficulties came from the general loss of all enthusiasm for the war, caused in part by the thought of the spoliation of nobles' estates that was going on back home. The man in the trench did not feel that he should die just when life was promising so much for the future.

The Bolsheviks were quick to make good use of this discontent and unwillingness to fight. They preached against the war as imperialistic and bourgeois, and urged the soldier to direct his weapons against the capitalists in his own government, rather than against the proletarian soldiers in the enemy ranks. This propaganda gave a justification to the deserter for his cowardice and his lack of "bourgeois" patriotism.¹³

In addition, the Germans were propagandizing the soldiers against continuing the war. "Right through the spring," Kerensky says, "the Bavarian Prince continued his efforts to undermine the morale of the Russian army by sending envoys with white flags to our trenches, allegedly to discuss peace terms."¹⁴ They continually insisted that Russia was fighting England's battle. "Oh, when *will* you come to realize that your gravedigger is England?"¹⁵

A particularly destructive form of propaganda coming from both the Germans and the Bolsheviks was that which urged the soldiers in the trenches to fraternize with the enemy. In an article in *Pravda* on May 11,

urging the soldiers to fraternize, Lenin said: "It is well that the soldiers curse the war. It is well that they clamor for peace . . . It is well that they, breaking the prison discipline, themselves begin to fraternize on all fronts . . ."¹⁶

Another problem before Kerensky as War Minister was the need to equip and clothe the Russian army.¹⁷ Many supplies had to be obtained abroad from the allies.

Still a further difficulty was a legacy from the old Empire: the problem of nationalities. Less than half the soldier mass was Great Russian. Here and there along the front some general would yield to nationalist agitation and form a special corps, such, for example, as the "Mussulman Corps with French discipline" on the Rumanian front.¹⁸

Such, then, were the problems that the new War Minister had to face in the accomplishment of the task placed upon him by the Provisional Government. This task, in his own words, was the "restoration by all means at hand of the fighting capacity of the army."¹⁹

In order to understand the activities of Kerensky in striving to accomplish this task, it seems in order first to consider the personal qualifications which would either help or hinder him in his work.

Physically, he had a score against him. His health was not very good. A Russian girl who was a secretary in the Winter Palace described him to an American as having "serious stomach trouble, a badly affected lung and kidney trouble."²⁰ There were psychological characteristics also which militated against his success. The same Russian girl spoke of him as being "really hysterical," as breaking down and weeping on the platform during public speeches, or, if not there, weeping alone in his office later.²¹ William H. Chamberlin says that his ". . . inability to think coldly and realistically outside the haze of his own glowing phrases, sentimentality that occasionally verged on hysteria and led to alternations between extreme optimism and extreme pessimism, capacity for self-hypnotism, marked him out for disastrous failure when the romantic illusions of national unity were shattered on the hard facts of class antagonism."²²

On the other hand Kerensky had qualities which tended to make him successful in his new position. These qualities Chamberlin has summed up thus: "A flamboyant oratorical style, a quick sense for the theatrical and the popular, a revolutionism of a not too dogmatic or definite hue, quickness of movement and gesture which created an external impression of strength of character."²³

He made himself popular with commoners by going

¹⁰ Golder, *op. cit.*, p. 417.

¹¹ For example, Admiral Kolchak in the Black Sea Fleet. Kerensky, *The Catastrophe* (New York, 1934), p. 199.

¹² Examples in "The Diary of General Boldyrev," *Red Archives, The Russian State Papers and Other Documents Relating to the Years 1915-1918*, Selected and edited by C. E. Vulliamy (London, 1929), pp. 189-226, *passim*.

¹³ A good instance of this type of propaganda is given in V. I. Lenin and Joseph Stalin, *The Russian Revolution* (New York, 1938), pp. 39-42.

¹⁴ *The Crucifixion of Liberty* (New York, 1934), p. 317.

¹⁵ Quoted from a German appeal to the Russian soldiers, *Ibid*.

¹⁶ Lenin and Stalin, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

¹⁷ David R. Francis, *Russia from the American Embassy* (New York, 1921), p. 123.

¹⁸ Leon Trotsky, *The History of the Russian Revolution* (New York, 1932), I, 374.

¹⁹ *The Catastrophe*, p. 184.

²⁰ Louise Bryant, *Six Months in Russia* (New York, 1918), p. 118.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 117.

²² *The Russian Revolution*, Vol. I, p. 150.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 149.

(Please turn to page thirty-five)

The Historical Setting of the Malthusian Theory

James R. Irwin

University of Detroit

OF ALL of the theories that have been advanced in an attempt to explain the study of population as among the fields of social and human sciences, perhaps none has received more publicity, yet deserved less, than the Malthusian theory of population.

Although the theory has been relegated to the more obscure pages of economic history by most thinking individuals, it periodically recurs in the secular press, even if only on the undergraduate level. Immediately, torrents of printer's ink are set off that serve only to revive interest in an idea that has been given more prominence than its true worth deserves.

One of the latest examples of its being brought to light again occurred recently in a heated exchange on the subject of Malthus' theory in the editorial columns of two undergraduate newspapers in the state of Michigan. One editorial writer in a Catholic college had set forth his opinions of the planned parenthood campaign of Bishop Oxnham and had characterized it as contrary to God's eternal and natural laws. His editorial had been picked up by his opponent who answered him by saying that any discussion of planned parenthood must consider the Malthusian theory of population.

This second writer then proceeded to argue that Malthus in his general principle that more people are born than can be adequately fed, was "probably" right. He further wrote that at any given time in the world's history there is an optimum population we can decently maintain. Therefore, this pundit explained, we owe nothing to the unborn, but we do owe ourselves at least the minimum guarantee that we will not multiply our misery.

The Catholic undergraduate editorial writer immediately answered this line of reasoning by pointing out that the fundamental error which vitiates Malthus' whole case was his failure to grasp the meaning of the term "human." If man were not rational, if his powers of intellect were no greater than the faculties of the animal, then, the writer continued, he might see a certain force in the Malthusian theory of population.

The Catholic editor then summarized by pointing out that the great stumbling block for men like Malthus was their unwillingness to look about them and to give assent to the obvious. Seeing no significance in man's ingenuity, being bound by the hardness and selfishness of the narrow material world, Malthus could not comprehend man's unbounded dominion over matter. Therefore, this undergraduate asked what made his opponent think that the views of an eighteenth century economist had any relevance in a discussion of planned parenthood and the natural law? The truth of the matter, he concluded, was that Malthus' ideas had no permanence whatever when measured against the mighty scope of Nature's providence. He characterized them as the wail-

ings of a blind wolf, the feeble utilitarian solution of a pessimistic materialist.

There the argument ended for the young man who had first brought up Malthus had met his match and was heard no more.

The significant thing about the whole argument, however, seemed to lie not only in the Catholic undergraduate's rather skillful refutation of the basic Malthusian theory but more so in the fact that Malthus' ideas should even have been considered by either party at all.

It seemed strange that any thinking person in this day and age should have to reach back to Malthus for any conclusion, sound or otherwise, as it rightly seemed that he was now but an interesting note in a textbook on history or economic thought. Yet here were his ideas being used as a basic ammunition in a rather heated debate between two intelligent students in American institutions of higher learning. And the question, why was Malthus being considered at all, seemed to keep presenting itself.

Perhaps, if all parties concerned knew the whole story behind the formulation of this particular theory, if they knew the historical setting of the Malthusian theory, they could more quickly comprehend its relative insignificance and would never again be tempted to argue the point in the columns of their newspapers. Again, perhaps, if all of us took a short time to examine into the reasons why Malthus wrote his theory in the first place, we could more easily dispose of it as mere interesting information but not worthy of intellectual consideration. Therefore, what was the historical setting of the Malthusian theory?

"Thomas Robert Malthus had graduated at Cambridge as ninth wrangler in the year 1788, in the twenty-second year of his age. In 1797, after gaining a fellowship at Jesus College"¹ he had taken a short vacation which he was spending with his father at Albury in Surrey, and in the next year, 1798, he was curate at Albury in Surrey. While vacationing together, father and son engaged in a series of discussions on questions of the day, which, while helping to pass the time away, soon resolved themselves into rather serious debates.

The discussions that young Malthus undertook with his father gave him a great deal of intellectual stimulation and pleasure. They were not of the usual type that might be expected between father and son but rather centered about certain prevailing philosophical notions then popular in western Europe. These ideas had been supported by an Englishman named Godwin and by a Frenchman, Condorcet. The main idea or theme was that the sorrows and evils of human life are largely traceable to faulty political systems and that any society

¹ James Bonar, *Malthus and His Work* (London, 1885), p. 6.

which had the determination and ability to set up and maintain an intelligent and rational political system could virtually assure its people of a life filled with comfort, tranquillity and order.²

The father, Daniel Malthus, upheld Godwin, a follower of John Locke, and in agreement with Condorcet argued that, because of the Industrial Revolution and its attendant evils, the Poor Laws and the Enclosures, among others, misery and starvation existed in the midst of plenty. This idea, in turn, had prompted Godwin to advocate a mild form of socialism, because, according to this movement, the main cause of the widespread human misery was the palpable injustice of economic institutions; the institutions were the invention of man, and thus subject to human direction. An abundant supply of social wealth existed, however, and if this were more equitably distributed, humanity could gain an easy existence in exchange for a moderate amount of work. The resulting leisure, spent in various intellectual and moral self-improvement pursuits, would result in an indefinite perfecting of human nature.³

During the course of these discussions the older man held consistently to these optimistic doctrines, but young Malthus insisted that human nature possessed certain inalienable features which would prevent an idyllic state from ever being realized. Man had a natural propensity to marry and have offspring, and he had clearly demonstrated his incapacity to increase his output of material goods fast enough to keep pace with the growth of population.

The debates thus started waxed friendly but furious and as Bonar has so clearly pointed out:

The fireside debates had in that year (1797) received new matter. William Godwin, quondam parson, journalist, politician, and novelist, whose *Political Justice* was avowedly a 'child of the Revolution', had written a new book, the *Enquirer*, in which many of his old positions were set in a new light. The father made it a point of honour to defend the *Enquirer*; the son played devil's advocate, partly from conviction, partly for the sake of argument; and, as often happens in such a case, Robert found his case stronger than he had thought. Hard pressed by an able opponent, he was led, on the spur of the moment, to use arguments which had not occurred to him before. In calmer moments he followed them up to their conclusions. 'The discussion,' he tells us, 'started the general question of the future improvement of society, and the author at first sat down with an intention of merely stating his thoughts to his friend upon paper in a clearer manner than he thought he could do in conversation.' But the subject opened upon him, and he determined to publish.⁴

Thus it was that a matter of family forensics aroused in Malthus the stimulus to consider the whole problem of population and resulted in his writing the essay that made him famous and provided a framework for the study of population for many years to come.

Here, then, is the real beginning of the Malthusian theory. It came about as the result of a series of debates or discussions with his father, Daniel Malthus, and he really undertook the writing of his thesis in a more stable form than conversation so that it would be more clearly understood by his worthy opponent, his father. Many have been the explanations offered as to why Malthus wrote his theory but this seems to be the most logical.

For further support of this stand that Malthus' theory is merely his stated arguments against his father's support of Godwin's stand in the *Enquirer* and *Political Justice*, we but have to turn to J. C. Ross' *An Examination of Opinions Maintained in an Essay on Population*, published in 1827, in which he says:

The Ostensible objects of that Essay are the general refutation of certain opinions which were entertained by a few persons at the period of the French Revolution, but, particularly, of those contained in a certain work, written by Mr. Godwin, and entitled, *Political Justice*. In which work (as we gather from Mr. Malthus) Mr. Godwin contends for the equity of a certain social system, which he proposes to be established on the basis of a community of wives and property.⁵

Thus, we see that Malthus originally formulated his theory as the result of his engaging in family forensics. As Bonar has pointed out, he was not too sure of his arguments so he wrote them down so as to follow them more logically to proper conclusions. As the subject then opened upon him he decided to publish his population theory in a more concrete form.

Therefore, in 1798 Malthus published anonymously his work which he called *An Essay on Population*. It is interesting to note, however, that he seemed to have little faith in his work for he neglected, either purposely or through oversight, to put his name to his publication. One might then logically ask why anyone else should consider the author's work when he himself evidently had such little faith in his own thoughts that he would not claim authorship of the document. Or as Bonar has aptly put it, "His *Essay* was merely an anonymous pamphlet in a political controversy, and was meant to turn the light of political economy upon the political philosophy of the day. Whatever the essay contained over and above politics, and however far afield the author eventually traveled in the later editions, there is no doubt about the first origin of the essay itself."⁶

One may then ask how it was that the *Essay* gained any prominence whatever, considering its rather obscure and humble origins? Perhaps that question is answered, at least partially, in the opening words of the narration of a currently popular mystery program on the national radio networks when a voice asks, "Who knows what evil lurks in the minds of men?" For while it may seem rather strong to say that only evil could have led anyone into accepting Malthus' basic ideas, the thought may not be too far-fetched when we consider that much evil has resulted in man's social thinking through persons who have read the essay and then tried to put these rather abstract ideas into actual practice.

In fact, too many followers of Malthus have pointed him out as one of the great minds of all time, whose theory has had far-reaching results. Inasmuch as we have just considered the real reasons why the theory was formulated in the first place, it is easy to state that it was primarily an answer to Godwin's political views, which have long ceased to interest us, and was not a searching social document destined to right the wrongs of eighteenth century England, as Malthusians

² Cf. Henry Pratt Fairchild, *People: The Quantity and Quality of Population* (New York, 1939).

³ Cf. Edward B. Reuter, *Population Problems* (Chicago, 1937).

⁴ Bonar, *op. cit.*, pp. 7-8.

⁵ J. C. Ross, *An Examination of Opinions Maintained in an Essay on Population* (London, 1827), Vol. I, III-IV.

⁶ Bonar, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

(Please turn to page thirty-eight)

A Unique Library of American History

Brendan C. McNally

College of the Holy Cross

DURING the early months of the David and Goliath struggle known as the War of 1812, to be exact, in the month of October in the year 1812, when our country had finally achieved the ripe old age of some thirty-seven years, Isaiah Thomas founded at Worcester, Massachusetts, a society for the collection and preservation of materials associated with the study of American history and antiquities. The society founded by Thomas still bears the name he gave to it: The American Antiquarian Society. In eighteenth century England, Ireland, and Scotland antiquarian societies functioned for the preservation of local documents and archaeological remains proper to their respective locales. The Thomas foundation, however, soon extended its activities far beyond the limited scope of local affairs and curios.

With the passage of time it has come to embrace not only the history of the United States, but almost every phase of the history of the American hemisphere. Thus, in a certain sense, today the American Antiquarian Society "sails under false colours", for it is a national library of American History, and might rightly be called The Isaiah Thomas Memorial Library of American History. The current title, hallowed though it is by age, is misleading. The professional historian knows the true nature of the institution, but the beginner in history and the layman might be confused, or deceived, by the title.

Although the name, Isaiah Thomas, may have been rather prominent in 1812 Worcester, the reader of the present day might arch an eyebrow or two and ask, who was Isaiah Thomas and why did he select Worcester, of all places, as the site for his undertaking? In answer to the first portion of the above-proposed queries, Isaiah Thomas (b. 1749), a native of Boston, was a better-than-well-to-do printer in early nineteenth century Worcester. Apprenticed at the age of six years to a Boston printer, Thomas proved a precocious and industrious lad. After several years of apprenticeship the young printer traveled first to Halifax and later to Charleston, South Carolina. In both places Thomas worked at his "chosen" trade. He returned to Boston in 1770, after four years of absence, and in July of that same year, along with Zechariah Fowle, his former employer, established the *Massachusetts Spy*. The partnership did not perdure too long, for Thomas soon purchased Fowle's interest and became the sole proprietor of the *Spy*. A champion of Liberty, Thomas was forced to leave Boston in April of 1775 and fled to Worcester, whither, with considerable foresight, he had sent his press and materials.¹ However, before he arrived

in Worcester, the rebel publisher took time out to associate himself with one Paul Revere and his fellows in the task of awakening the Middlesex countryside, not to mention taking part in the skirmishes at Lexington and Concord.

The displaced Bostonian set up his press at Worcester and became a prosperous citizen, so much so that he was able to retire from business activities in 1802 and entrusted the direction of his business interests to the care of his son.² Thomas then devoted his hard earned leisure to scholarly pursuits. In 1810 he wrote a two volume work, *History of Printing in America*, which, "will probably continue to be a standard authority for the earlier period" of printing.³ Two years later, realizing the need for a society devoted to the preservation and study of the materials of American history, Thomas founded and, on October 24, 1812, incorporated the American Antiquarian Society of which he became the first president. His gifts to the society, including books, manuscripts, building, land, and endowment, amounted to \$50,000. He has been described by an old friend, Governor Levi Lincoln, as a "public spirited citizen, generous in his contributions to all worthy objects, and a most efficient co-operator with others in promoting the growth, improvement and prosperity of the place."⁴

And in answer to the second portion of the questions advanced above, *viz.*, why was Worcester selected? In 1812 Worcester was simply a small cross-roads town, located at the far end of the Old Boston Post Road. Thomas might have selected his native Boston as the location of his new foundation had not some unfortunate conditions currently prevailed. He and his fellow New Englanders of those distant days, while not overly concerned about the dangers of sudden air-attacks or the horrors of atomic warfare, knew that their extensive coastline was extremely vulnerable to possible attack by the ships of His Britannic Majesty. A safe, secure, inland site, some spot really remote from the seacoast was necessary as the depository for precious materials; the British "barbarians" might pillage and destroy. Consequently, Worcester, forty-four miles from Boston and an equal distance from Providence, Rhode Island, was selected. Perhaps the reader might be interested to read Thomas's own observation upon the selection:

² An autographed copy of the first edition of the *Massachusetts Spy* published at Worcester, May 3, 1775, may be seen in the Dinand Library at the College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass. This rare copy of the *Spy*, one of the library's most treasured items of Americana, was presented to the Dinand Library by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Richard Joseph Haberlin of the Class of 1906.

³ Michael Kraus, *A History of American History* (New York, 1937), p. 484.

⁴ Robert W. G. Vail. *Dictionary of American Biography*, XVIII, 435, 436. The quotation from Governor Lincoln may be found in Vail's sketch of Isaiah Thomas's life.

¹ Thomas's press has been preserved and may be seen in the Thomas Room of the American Antiquarian Society.

For the better preservation from the destruction so often experienced in large towns and cities by fire, as well as from the ravages of an enemy, to which seaports in particular are so much exposed in time of war, it is universally agreed that for a place of deposit for articles intended to be preserved for ages, and of which many, if destroyed or carried away, could never be replaced by others of the like kind, an inland situation is to be preferred; this consideration alone was judged sufficient for placing the Library and Museum of this Society forty miles distant from the nearest branch of the sea, in the town of Worcester, Massachusetts.⁵

The visitor of today, viewing the imposing library building at the corner of Park Avenue and Salisbury Street would scarcely give thought to the humble beginnings of 1812 as he made his way along the slate-flag, tree-shaded walk to the impressive pillared entrance. Any thoughts of 1812 and fears of British attack, if they existed, would be quickly dispelled upon entrance into the domed and spacious reading room. Whether the stranger be from Palo Alto or Passaic, Boston or St. Louis, a gracious reception is extended and inquiry made as to the reason for the visit. Some come only to look, others desire information concerning some almost-forgotten ancestor who had lived in one, or the other, of the older New England towns. Students and scholars come seeking materials for theses and books. There is no formality and less red-tape. If the visitor requests available information, volumes of genealogies, newspapers, old periodicals, or printed volumes are secured and working space is provided. The visitor is asked to sign the guest-book, nothing more.⁶

The present library building was completed in 1910 at the cost of \$172,000; in 1924, when the dollar was still worth one hundred cents, a wing, costing \$100,000, was added to provide additional book stacks. The main feature of the building is the large rotunda reading room, surrounded by four work-rooms and six alcove-rooms for special collections. On the second floor are the map and print rooms, almanac room, manuscript room, and exhibition hall. In the rear are located the stacks, each five floors high. It has been estimated that the linear shelf measurement of the entire library is close to eleven miles.

Some notion of the value of the holdings may be gathered from the fact that the Society's collection of American newspapers from 1690 to 1820, alone, totals 1496 titles and a conservative appraisal sets the number of individual issues of newspapers in the files for this same period at a sum total in excess of 500,000. Thus, in this phase of early Americana the Antiquarian easily ranks first, for only the Library of Congress collection with 936 titles and that of the Widener Library at Harvard University with 732 titles approach in any way, whatsoever, its size and completeness.⁷ The entire collection numbers approximately 18,000 volumes and

includes many important files published abroad, in addition to the native publications. There is, for example a comparatively complete file of the *London Gazette* from 1665 to 1796, and a file of the *London Chronicle* for the years 1757 to 1784.

The collection of almanacs and registers, which totals in the neighborhood of 20,500 pieces, is the largest in the country and includes, over and above those printed in the United States, files of Canadian, Mexican, West Indian, and South American almanacs, and British almanacs through the year 1783. Here the investigator will find valuable and pertinent materials touching almost every phase of American history. The resources of the library contain information for the scholar whether he seeks information concerning the aborigines of the North and South American continents, or is interested in the early religious history of our country, early American folk-music, the literature of the Revolution, the War of 1812, the Westward Movement, slavery, the Civil War, and so on down to our own day and age. The student desirous of perusing the history of our neighbors to the South may draw upon the Latin American collection of 17,000 volumes. Among the library's collection is the most extensive collection of the writings of the Mather family, their manuscripts, private library and family portraits.

A statistical breakdown of the possessions of this unique library shows that it has in excess of 265,000 volumes, 234,832 pamphlets, 100,000 manuscripts and many thousands of maps, broadsides, and engravings. Expressed in terms of money, the collections are valued at two million-plus dollars. Strange as it may seem, the entire foundation is supported by gifts and bequests and has never enjoyed financial grant or subsidization from government, city or state. It has never known the security and affluence of financial support by a large educational institution or grant from one of the numerous large foundations.⁸

Membership in the Antiquarian Society is honorary, vacancies being filled by election at the annual meetings. Its roster through the years has included nearly all great historians interested in American history, many of the leading men of public prominence in our own country, as well as distinguished scholars from abroad. To mention but a few names of famous men who have been privileged to have their names inscribed as members, we cite Thomas Jefferson, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, John Adams, James Madison, John Quincy Adams, Washington Irving, Robert Fulton, Reuben Gold Thwaites, Sir George Otto Trevelyan, Frederick Jackson Turner, Woodrow Wilson, Calvin Coolidge,

can Newspapers, 1690-1820, 2 vols., by Clarence Saunders Brigham. These volumes, representing thirty-five years of effort and research, list all the known newspaper publications in the United States, the number of copies extant and the places where they may be found.

⁸ Clifford Kenyon Shipton, "The American Antiquarian Society," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Ser., II (April, 1945), 164-172, incl. In this article the reader will find an excellent account of the aims of the society and a detailed description of the choice possessions of the Library. Dr. Shipton is the present librarian of the Antiquarian.

(Please turn to page forty-one)

⁵ Robert W. G. Vail, *A Guide to the Resources of the American Antiquarian Society* (Worcester, 1937), p. 12.

⁶ This lack of formality is an old, long-standing policy of the Antiquarian, as John Bach McMaster discovered to his delight when searching newspapers for this great work. Cf. Eric F. Goldman, *John Bach McMaster, American Historian* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1943), p. 33. The author records: "McMaster reveled in the cooperation of the American Antiquarian Society in Worcester, Massachusetts, which turned him loose in the rooms where the newspapers were stored."

⁷ During the current year the American Antiquarian Society has published a monumental work, *History and Bibliography of Ameri-*

Toynbee's Philosophy of History

Thomas P. Neill

Saint Louis University

D. C. Somervell's abridgement of Arnold J. Toynbee's study of history is one of those rare scholarly tomes that is also a best seller.* People are reading Toynbee partly because he writes so gracefully, partly because he packs so much knowledge and so much exotic information into a single volume, and partly because his publisher arranged so astute a publicity campaign, but mostly because they hope to use his study as a touchstone for discovering where this crazy world of ours is going. This is a work which will endure as a classic, but its popularity is due to the troubled times in which it appeared and for which people hope it might provide some solution.

Mr. Somervell's abridgement of Toynbee's original six volumes into one is so skillfully done that it turns out to be intrinsically a better work than the original six volumes. It is particularly valuable for laying bare Toynbee's argument—and *A Study of History* is one long argument—by peeling off thousands of pages of unnecessary though enlightening examples, and by eliminating many discourses tangential from the main theme of the work. The abridgement shows clearly that Toynbee wrestles with the problems of the theologian and the philosopher, not of the historian.

A Study of History, indeed, is not a historical study; it is rather a socio-philosophical study made with historical data. For that reason, Toynbee is subject to criticism from theologians, historians, sociologists, and historians, and perhaps only the philosopher is qualified to pass definitive judgment on his work. No one person, however, is competent to pass on the historical accuracy of the factual data crammed into these 600 pages; no one is able to judge the relevancy of the thousands of examples adduced to validate the laws of historical growth and decay which Toynbee seeks to establish. The historian can point out errors of fact, as the statement that Pepin was crowned emperor in 749; he can show errors of interpretation, as the author's rather poor handling of the medieval struggle between the papacy and the empire; he can find irrelevant and erroneous examples, as when the author asserts that North Carolina "produced" Woodrow Wilson. Finally, the historian who is sufficiently small-minded can condemn this work because it is based largely on secondary sources, a good number of which are now largely obsolete, or because it ranges through all ages and all lands, dealing with all peoples as though they existed simultaneously on this earth.

But such criticisms are not relevant to judging the worth of Toynbee's study. Whether a few facts out of a million, or a few examples out of thousands are

erroneous makes little difference, for *A Study of History* is not an empirical work based upon factual data. The six-volume edition, it is true, somehow left the impression that Toynbee's conclusions emerged from the facts he studied, but the abridgement shows that the author imposes his laws on historical data, and thus he uses his comparative study of twenty-one civilizations to support conclusions he had already arrived at in a general way from his previous studies in Hellenic civilization. This study, then, is an argument backed up with profuse illustrations that the reader must, in most cases, accept on faith in Toynbee's well-established reputation for intellectual honesty and technical ability. It is based essentially on the rise and decline of Hellenic civilization, the general trends of which are corroborated or modified by comparing this civilization with twenty others.

The author insists that the "intelligible unit" of history is not a nation or a class but a civilization. In his first three volumes he studies the genesis and the growth of various civilizations, in the course of which study he concludes to two now famous laws: that of challenge-and-response, and that of withdrawal-and-return. Civilizations are born if they respond successfully to challenges presented to them by their physical environment; they grow if the challenge is severe enough to provoke a response, but not so severe as to exhaust the civilization meeting it, as is the case with the Eskimos meeting the challenge of living in the polar regions. Growth continues as long as a civilization continues to respond successfully to various internal challenges set up within its framework. Growth is achieved for a civilization by a "creative minority" whose leadership is accepted voluntarily by the rest of society.

The second three volumes deal with the breakdown and the disintegration of civilizations. As he had previously done in the section on growth of civilizations, the author investigates and rejects the cases presented by racialists and by determinists, economic or environmental, and he concludes that breakdown, like growth, is essentially a spiritual thing. A civilization breaks down when it fails to meet the challenge presented to it, and it disintegrates when it is divided into a dominant minority and a "proletariat," a class that feels itself "in but not of" the society of which it is a part. The creative minority has now become dominant; instead of ruling by reason of its appeal to the masses it coerces them by force.

This section of the study—in which the general reader is undoubtedly most interested—contains Toynbee's excellent sociological analysis of alternative ways of behavior, feeling, and living that can be discerned in a disintegrating society. It also contains his analysis of the relation between the individual and society in

**A Study of History*, by Arnold J. Toynbee (Abridgement of Volumes I-VI by D. C. Somervell). New York. Oxford University Press. 1947. pp. xiii, 617. \$5.00

their age of decline. It is almost impossible to read this analysis of disintegration without keeping in mind our own Western civilization, as Toynbee himself has done. The least convincing part of his study, it seems to this reader, is his analysis of the rhythm of disintegration and the roles played by the proletariat in setting up a "higher religion," and by the dominant minority in setting up a universal philosophy and a universal state. The conclusion for Western civilization, at any rate, is that we are likely reaching the peak of our time of troubles and that we can reasonably expect a universal state of some kind or other within the next few hundred years.

What will impress most readers of this study is the wealth of material crammed into its pages, the profusion of illustrations offered by the author who seems as much at home in the Yellow River valley as in the Thames, who talks as intimately of Erech or Ur as of London, as knowingly of Lugalzaggisi, Bar Kokaba, or Ts'in She Hwang-ti as of Stalin. Toynbee aptly illustrates his quotations from the written literature of all peoples, from their mythology and their folklore, and especially does his work abound in biblical quotations. Indeed, though its language is usually scientific, the abridged volume strikes one rather as an epic poem of mankind's sojourn on earth than as a socio-philosophical study. For Toynbee possesses the genius to use scientific methodology without becoming its slave. Certainly his conclusion is that of a poet:

The work of the Spirit of the Earth, as he weaves and draws his threads on the Loom of Time, is the temporal history of man as this manifests itself in the geneses and growths and breakdowns and disintegrations of human societies; and in all this welter of life and tempest of action we can hear the beat of an elemental rhythm whose variations we have learnt to know as challenge-and-response, withdrawal-and-return, rout-and-rally, apparentation-and-affiliation, schism-and-palingenesia.

A Study of History must be evaluated as a philosophy of history. As such, it deserves to be called a classic. In the history of this *genre* of writing it will go down as a healthy renewal of the great tradition of a Christian philosophy of history. To be properly understood, Toynbee's study must be placed against the two philosophies that hold the field in modern times: Marx's materialistic determinism on the one hand, and Spengler's organismic theory of growth and decay on the other. Against Marx, Toynbee asserts the supremacy of the spirit even in secular affairs by insisting that the real historical process is essentially a spiritual process. Stressing the role of the individual, of his intelligence and his will, Toynbee puts his faith in human reason and approaches his problem as one who thinks in the great humanist tradition. Against Spengler, Toynbee drives home the argument that "a civilization is not like an animal organism, condemned by an inexorable destiny to die after traversing a predetermined life-curve. Even if all other civilizations that have come into existence so far were to prove in fact to have followed this path, there is no known law of historical determinism that compels us to leap out of the intolerable frying-pan of our time of troubles into the slow and steady fire of a universal state where we shall in due course be reduced to dust and ashes." Unfortunately, it should be noted

parenthetically, the author uses biological language frequently enough to leave the casual reader thinking of societies in terms of human growth and decay, forgetting the warning contained in such passages as that quoted above. But one cannot imagine what other terms Toynbee could have used to express his thought on societies' growth and decay without inventing an entirely new terminology.

This study is valuable because it contains much real wisdom and because it explodes various crude but widely accepted philosophies of history. Environmental determinism and other materialistic explanations of man's life on earth are shown to be inadequate explanations. To historians this study is valuable chiefly for a new point of departure it suggests in reinterpreting many aspects of Western history. Toynbee's conclusions on the "nemesis of creativity," for example, suggest a departure for the study of the bourgeoisie's failure to meet the social challenges presented to it in the results of the Industrial Revolution. Certainly his law of "nemesis of creativity" appears a fuller explanation than Marx's dialectic or Spengler's senescence.

A Study of History offers the best philosophy of history to appear in recent times; if it replaces the Marxian and the Spenglerian explanations of history, then Toynbee will have done a real service to Western civilization. His work is written in the best tradition of neo-humanism. Philosphers will long argue whether it has suffered or benefited from the unmistakable strain of Hegelianism that runs through it. In many ways, indeed, Toynbee's laws of challenge-and-response, withdraw-and-return, rout-and-rally, seem to be merely intelligent applications of Hegel's dialectic. At any rate, it is a better application of Hegelianism than one finds in Marx—or even in Hegel's own philosophy of history.

Despite its many good qualities and its value as against Marx and Spengler, *A Study of History* does not offer the reader a full and a definite philosophy of history. *A priori*, such a work can be done only by one who is a competent historian and a good philosopher—and perhaps a good theologian. Toynbee has a fuller and better command of historical data than anyone who has tried to formulate a philosophy of history, for he is one of the few philosophers of history who knows his history. It is on the philosophical-theological side that his weakness is most apparent.

A satisfactory philosophy of history must be teleological. Otherwise it falls in that no-man's land between ordinary mundane history and a true philosophy of history which goes to the ultimates in mankind's life on earth. Toynbee does a good job in catching the rhythm of mankind's march upon earth, but he fails to discover where it is marching. He does well in showing the "how" of this march, but he is deficient in showing the "where" or the "why." His work can best be evaluated in a single sentence by borrowing one of his own similes. In several places, Toynbee likens a civilization to a group of mountain climbers who have successfully overcome several obstacles on their ascent to the top of a mountain. They rest on a ledge, and if they have so exhausted themselves getting onto the ledge, then they

will go no further and their civilization's growth is arrested. Toynbee can himself be put on the ledge. He sees well what is below, and he shows how the ascent has been so far made. But one cannot get a proper view from the ledge itself. To write a full and a satisfactory philosophy of history one must look upon the ascent from a detached point of view—the top of the mountain, or an airplane, or some such comparatively remote place.

It would be harsh, however, to condemn this study for not being perfect. It will remain a classic among Western man's philosophies of history—and the abridgement by Somervell will stand superior to the six volumes he abridged. Rather than term this work "the epic that failed," as one Irish reviewer has done, it would be closer to the truth to call it "the epic that almost succeeded." For a philosophy of history is not like a problem in mathematics, that is either rightly solved or not at all; it is a study that will never be perfectly done by one who writes from a historical point of view. Toynbee has come nearer the truth than anyone else in recent years.

Alexander Kerensky

(Continued from page twenty-eight)

about shaking hands "with road menders and all other persons of smudgy face or torn jacket who came close enough for handclasp."²⁴

His oratorical power over an audience was remarkable. Bruce Lockhart, who had occasion to hear him during this period, says that, in his own peculiar way, he "must be described as one of the great orators of history . . ." A particular speech in Moscow, he said, "was an epic performance—more impressive in its emotional reactions than any speech Hitler or of any orator I have ever heard."²⁵ Kerensky was very well aware of his own oratorical power, and relied on it in his major attempt to restore the morale of the army, his speech-making tour at the front in May and June.

Immediately after he assumed the portfolio of War and Marine, Kerensky initiated a series of administrative measures that would reflect the new democratic spirit of the coalition government and at the same time help to restore discipline.

His first act, he tells us, was an order "forbidding the resignation of any officers of the army in the field."²⁶ This he did because he believed some of the high commanders were planning to resign in protest against his forthcoming official publication of the "Declaration of the Rights of Soldiers." "I believed," he says, "that discipline was to be demanded first from people who by virtue of their position should have served as models of the performance of duty."²⁷

His next step was the official publication of the "Declaration of the Rights of Soldiers." Thus he sought to win the support of the soldiery by his official approval

of this democratic proclamation. But he did not forget that in order to restore the fighting capacity of the army he would have to reestablish the power and authority of the commanders. For this purpose he inserted the following point in the Declaration: "At times of action the commander has the right to apply any measure, including the use of armed force, against subordinates who fail to obey his orders."²⁸

Another change in the Declaration was in the eighteenth point, concerning appointments. This Kerensky revised in such a way that the committees could no longer interfere in making appointments.²⁹

Another early administrative measure was the termination of the "dual authority" in the administration of the Petrograd garrison. This he accomplished by making the staff of the Petrograd military district responsible to the War Office in place of the Soviet.³⁰

To meet the problem of the interference of the committees in the direction of the army, he assigned commissars to every army, responsible to the government. Their task was to raise the morale of the troops and act as liaison officers between the old-fashioned generals and the new soldier organizations. Thus the network of committees was brought under the control of the government.³¹

But these initial measures, Kerensky tells us, were undertaken "merely with the object of clearing the field for my basic activity, the bringing about of a sharp change in the attitude and sentiment of the army."³² This task, he felt, demanded his presence at the front. Accordingly, from mid-May until his assumption of the premiership on July 20th, he spent most of his time at the front. During this period he took little part in the work of the Provisional Government so far as internal affairs were concerned.

The manner in which the inspection took place has been described by Kerensky:

The mode of inspection was always the same: We walked down the line, swinging around into the heart of the ranks to an improvised platform. On our mounting the platform, came the word of command and from all sides thousands of troops would rush towards us, surrounding the platform in a huge circle. The commanders spoke first, followed by committee delegates. Then I came, and then the discontented, hesitating mass of armed human beings in gray, confused in mind and weary in body and spirit, would become animated by a kind of new life. Their souls would become aglow with enthusiasm which at times reached the peaks of mad ecstasy. It was not always easy to escape from this raging sea of human beings to our automobiles and speed away to the next inspection.³³

The impression made on the soldiers by Kerensky's speeches was usually very strong, almost electrical. There was a drive, an emotional appeal, a sinking home of the rallying points in short, staccato-like sentences. The appeal was always in the name of the Revolution, in behalf of the liberty it had won for the people.³⁴ Prolonged and boisterous ovations and shouts of approval and loyalty followed his speeches. Unfortunately, the

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ These were the changes that caused Lenin to term it a "Declaration of the Lack of Rights of Soldiers."

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 188.

³¹ Chamberlin, *op. cit.*, p. 151.

³² *The Catastrophe*, p. 189.

³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 196-197.

³⁴ Texts of Kerensky's speeches in A. J. Sack, *The Birth of the Russian Democracy* (New York, 1918), and Golder, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

²⁴ Louis P. Kirby, *The Russian Revolution* (Boston, 1940), p. 200.

²⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 175 and 177.

²⁶ *The Catastrophe*, p. 186.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

effect generally did not last long. Even Kerensky himself admits this.³⁵

The reason for the transitoriness of the effect might be found partly in the fact that the ovations were not entirely the expression of enthusiasm for Kerensky's ideals; for, as Mr. Kirby points out, the soldiers in the ranks usually had the impulse to cheer whenever encouraged to do so, "simply because discipline held them silent so much of the time."³⁶ A further explanation lies in the emotional nature of Kerensky's appeals; as soon as the sentimental effect wore off, the old tendencies and lines of reasoning would re-assert themselves. The odds against Kerensky were simply too great for any man to overcome. Only a promise of peace, immediate peace, would win the genuine support of the troops. But as Kerensky saw the situation, it was impossible to make such a promise, for that would mean victory for Germany and a peace based on imperialist lines. Hence, he was ultimately bound to fail.

Kerensky's first visit was to the Galician front for which he set out on May 20, two days after becoming Minister of War. Here General Brussilov was in command. Together they covered scores of positions in a few days. It was important to examine these troops and to stir up their enthusiasm, because they were to lead in the offensive that was to begin within a month's time.

At Kamenetz-Podolsk, where General Brussilov had his headquarters, Kerensky addressed a large army conference of officers and men. "Forward to the battle for freedom! I summon you not to a feast but to death!"³⁷ These words used in his speech before this conference were the keynote of all his addresses before the troops in the front line positions.

From the Galician front Kerensky went to Odessa and from there to Sevastopol, where he had to adjust differences between Admiral Kolchak and the crews of his Black Sea Fleet.³⁸ In the beginning the admiral had managed to hold his authority over the men, on account of his attractive personality. But as the sailors absorbed more and more of the revolutionary spirit, difficulties had arisen between the admiral and the popularly elected committees. Kerensky was able to smooth over the differences and reconcile Kolchak to his men.³⁹ After Kerensky left Sevastopol he went to Kiev, where trouble with the Ukrainian nationalists was brewing.

His next move was to general headquarters at Mohileff. Here his conversations with General Alexeev convinced him of the general's unreliability. He determined to remove him and put General Brussilov in his place as commander-in-chief. To accomplish this, he went to Petrograd for a day, where he managed to get the change put through.⁴⁰

From the capital he went directly to the northern front where he visited the eleventh army in a position near Mitau, under General Radko-Dmitriev. While

stopping at this place, there occurred an interesting incident which illustrates how Kerensky was able to manage men. A certain agitator, who had stirred up his whole regiment, was brought face to face with Kerensky. When he remained silent, his comrades pushed him forward urging him to speak up. Finally he did. Kerensky reports him as saying:⁴¹ "What I want to say is this: You say we must fight, so that the peasants may have the land, but of what use is the land to me, for instance, if I am killed?"

Thereupon Kerensky stepped toward the little soldier, and turning toward General Radko-Dmitriev said: "General, I order you to remove this soldier immediately. Pack him off at once to his village. Let his fellow villagers know that the Russian Revolution has no need of cowards."

The little soldier did not know what to answer, and begged to remain at his post, where he subsequently became a model of loyal obedience.

After leaving the eleventh army, Kerensky visited the seventh army under the command of General Danilov. His next visit was to the neighboring fifth army, which was honeycombed with Bolshevik propagandists. At a meeting of representatives of all the committees of the fifth army at Dvinsk, Kerensky had an encounter with a Bolshevik agitator,⁴² which turned out in the same way as the incident described in the preceding paragraph.

From Dvinsk, Kerensky went to Moscow, where he was busy for two days. Thence he came on June 14 to Petrograd, where the first All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies was to open on June 15. At this meeting Kerensky and Lenin met and crossed swords verbally. Kerensky's appeal to the delegates for their support of the coming offensive won their vote of approval. Lenin with his Bolshevik plan of turning all power over to the soviets was defeated by a vote of 543 to 126.⁴³

The offensive was the biggest event of Kerensky's War Ministry. We have just seen how he spent nearly a month on his speech-making tour trying to stir up the enthusiasm of the troops.

Just why Kerensky decided on making the offensive has been explained in various ways. Yet no one is in a better position to tell us the true reason for it than Kerensky himself. He says:

The fact is that the resumption of active operations by the Russian Army after two months of paralysis was dictated absolutely by the inner development of events in Russia. To be sure, the representatives of the Allies insisted on the execution by Russia, at least in part, of the strategic plan adopted at the Inter-Allied conference in Petrograd, in February, 1917. But the insistence of the Allies would have been of no avail if the necessity of the offensive had not been dictated by our own political consideration.⁴⁴

Kerensky realized that if the army continued to disintegrate as it had since March, the Germans would be able soon to dictate a peace which Russia would have to accept. Further, if the Eastern front collapsed entirely, Germany might rush to a quick victory on the Western front before American troops could come into action. That would make Germany master of Europe,

³⁵ *The Catastrophe*, p. 197.

³⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 200.

³⁷ Kerensky, *Catastrophe*, p. 195.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 199.

³⁹ The rapprochement lasted, however, for only one month.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 202.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 203.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 205.

⁴³ Golder, *op. cit.*, p. 360.

⁴⁴ *Catastrophe*, p. 207.

and the Socialist aim of a "peace without annexations" would be lost. In that event also, Russia stood to lose all the gains of the revolution, since a victorious Kaiser would probably prefer to deal with a restored, though weakened, monarch in Russia. The people realized this and, for awhile at least, stood behind Kerensky and the offensive.⁴⁵

Important groups in Russia were demanding the need of an offensive to "wipe out the shame" of the Russian army after its defeats in 1915 and 1916. A meeting of officers at general headquarters in May insisted on the need of resumption of action at the front.⁴⁶ The conference of representatives from the front meeting at Petrograd at the same time likewise demanded that the army assume the offensive. A private session of Duma members on June 16 declared: "The Duma recognizes that only in an immediate offensive . . . lies the sole hope of a speedy liquidation of the war and the strengthening of the liberties won by the people."⁴⁷

The All-Russian Cossacks' Congress, meeting in mid-June, issued a unanimous resolution that "the only means for obtaining the peace so needed for the proper up-building of the Government appears to be an immediate and decisive offensive."⁴⁸ Thus it was both on his own conviction, and on the demand of strong groups in the country that Kerensky decided on the offensive.

Before leaving for the front again he spent some days in Petrograd. Here he won the support of the Congress of Soviets referred to above, and visited the Cossack Congress which passed the resolution just quoted. From the committees of the Petrograd garrison he obtained the promise of their loyalty during the offensive at the front.

With these assurances of support to back him up, the War Minister left Petrograd on June 26 for the southwestern front where the offensive was to begin. His first stop was at Tarnopol where he made public the order to the troops to begin the advance on July 1.

The question strongly before the mind of Kerensky at this time was: Will the troops obey the order to advance? Among the men many were sullen, and gave only a perfunctory obedience. Some officers were without heart, and some were definitely opposed to the offensive.⁴⁹ On the other hand, some patriotic men and officers were eager for the advance and put themselves in the vanguard. For the moment, the influence of Kerensky's appeals as he harangued the troops amid rainstorms and under enemy fire, and the excited atmosphere of preparations stirred the masses to initial enthusiasm for the offensive.

On June 29, Kerensky published his order to the army and fleet to advance. Having explained to them the reasons for the offensive, he urged them forward:

Warriors, Our Country is in Danger! Liberty and revolution are threatened. The time has come for the army to do its duty . . . I call upon the armies, strengthened by the vigor and spirit of the revolution, to take the offensive.

Let not the enemy celebrate prematurely his victory over us!

⁴⁵ "Appeal of the Soviet to the Army," May, 1917, given in Golder, *op. cit.*, pp. 397-399.

⁴⁶ Kerensky, *Catastrophe*, p. 22.

⁴⁷ Sack, *op. cit.*, p. 410.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 409.

⁴⁹ Kerensky, *Catastrophe*, pp. 218-219.

Let all nations know that when we talk of peace it is not because we are weak! . . .

Officers and soldiers! Know that all Russia gives you its blessing on your undertaking, in the name of liberty, the glorious future of the country, and an enduring and honorable peace.

Forward!⁵⁰

The attack began on the southwestern front, where General Hutor was in command. After several days' preparation by the heavy artillery, the infantry began the attack on July 1. At first everything went well for the Russians. Kerensky, watching operations through a telescope from a front-line observation point, rejoiced in the capture of 10,000 prisoners and several cannon on the first day of battle.⁵¹ Progress was made in the direction of Breczezany and before Stanislov.⁵² The eighth army, under General Kornilov, broke through the Austrian lines at Kalusch, and pushed deep into enemy territory, capturing the old city of Galich on July 10.

Very shortly, however, the tide of battle turned. The men who had been enthusiastic for the offensive had gone into the front lines and had nearly all been killed. The soldiers who should have taken their places had only half-heartedly supported the offensive. Now they began to waver and turn back. Especially was this true where fresh German troops were being rushed in to replace the weakened Austrians.

Before long, a counter-offensive of the Germans broke through the Russian line at a place where an unruly regiment had abandoned its position.⁵³ They pushed through as far as the river Zbruch inside Russian territory, and could have gone much farther had they wished, for the whole armed force of Russia was threatening to collapse. The commissars and chairmen of the army committees on the southwestern front described the shocking conditions in a telegram:

The majority of the troops are becoming more and more demoralized. No one listens to authority or orders. Persuasion and pleading are in vain, and are answered by threats and even by shots. In some cases the men deserted their posts at the first shot of the enemy, and in other cases they did not even wait for the enemy to show himself. . . . Orders for hurried reinforcements were debated for hours. . . . For a distance of a hundred verests in the rear one can see deserters on the move, with or without guns, able-bodied, bold, shameless, and fearless of consequences. . . .⁵⁴

It was against such odds that Kerensky worked desperately at the front, striving to stave off utter destruction.

On the western front, under General Deniken, and also on the northern front, the offensive was begun in mid-July. Here, too, Kerensky exerted to the utmost his persuasive powers to induce the troops to carry on the offensive energetically. Unfortunately, the odds against him were too great, and very soon the Russian operations became purely defensive.

Meanwhile, internal events were rapidly heading toward the political crisis that would place Kerensky at the head of the government. Down in the Ukraine a nationalist movement was developing. It reached a

⁵⁰ Golder, *op. cit.*, pp. 426-427.

⁵¹ *Catastrophe*, p. 222.

⁵² Stuart R. Tompkins, *Russia Through the Ages* (New York, 1940), p. 557.

⁵³ George Vernadsky, *A History of Russian* (New Haven, 1946), p. 243.

⁵⁴ Golder, *op. cit.*, pp. 428-429.

climax in the issuing of a manifesto by the Ukrainian Rada on June 24,⁵⁵ declaring itself practically an autonomous state within the empire. After the failure of the government's appeal to the Ukrainians not to act hastily, a delegation consisting of Tereschenko, Tseretelli, and Kerensky was sent to Kiev to try to come to some agreement. On some points they yielded to the Ukrainian demands in order to secure their continued cooperation in the war. When the delegates reported to the Provisional Government on July 15 the terms on which they had agreed with the Ukrainians, the four Cadet members of the ministry resigned in protest.⁵⁶

Simultaneously with this weakening of the Provisional Government, demonstrations broke out in Petrograd. From July 16 to July 20, disorder reigned in the capital. Kerensky left for the front late on July 16, just soon enough to escape capture by the Bolshevik inspired insurgents. From the front he insistently wired to the government to use strong measures in putting down the outbreak.⁵⁷ On July 19 he returned to the capital, just as things were quieting down a little, after the publication of documents incriminating Lenin and the Bolsheviks with treasonable cooperation with the Germans.⁵⁸

In the midst of the crisis, on July 20, Prime Minister Lvov resigned. There was one strong man in the government, to whom the remaining ministers looked to fill the vacancy—that man was Kerensky. On the very day of Lvov's resignation, they appointed Kerensky Prime Minister,⁵⁹ allowing him to retain the portfolio of War and Marine.

With Kerensky's subsequent difficulties in the formation of a ministry this paper, limited to the May 18 to July 20 period of his Ministry, cannot be concerned; nor can we here discuss the final failure of the offensive, the much-debated Kornilov affair, and the ultimate overthrow of Kerensky's government by the Bolsheviks.

Kerensky had entered the War Ministry at a crucial time, when the question of war aims had brought on a practical impasse between Milukov and the Socialists. Kerensky's own ideas on the war coincided with those of the Socialists. Backed by powerful groups, he launched into the twofold task of the democratic organization of the army together with re-establishment of discipline, and of restoring the fighting capacity of the army in preparation for the coming offensive. Both by executive orders and by the persuasive force of his own words, he sought to accomplish these tasks.

His success was only partial. However, his activities in the War Ministry had significant results. He had made himself conspicuous, and thus had paved the way to his selection for the premiership. The launching of the offensive had diverted German troops from the west front to the east, and thus prevented a possible German victory before American troops could arrive. The tactical failure of the offensive made the Allies aware of the genuine weakness of the Russian army, and

henceforth they left it out of their strategic calculations. Similarly, the failure of the offensive, and the near success of the July uprising revealed the weakness of the Provisional Government both at the front and in the rear. Thus the way was open for the Kornilov attack from the right, which failed; and for the Bolshevik attack from the left, which, unfortunately for Russia, succeeded only too well.

Malthusian Theory

(Continued from page thirty)

would have us believe. Actually, Malthus' entire thinking is characteristic of that indulged in by the average country gentleman of 1750 rather than by the supporters of the new industrial system which was then just beginning to be established in England.

Bearing the foregoing considerations in mind, it should be apparent that any reference to Malthus in view of our knowledge of the background of the theory is giving prominence to a writer who should long ago have been discarded, except, perhaps, for passing mention in history books. Yet, as explained in the opening statements of this paper, we see Malthus' ideas being given voice in a discussion of the latest social evil, planned parenthood. And if we bear in mind what a modern population writer, Reuter, has stated, that the theory as it was originally formulated by Malthus was merely a restatement of ideas that had been current in the social and economic thought for half a century before his time, we can readily see that it was mainly designed to explain poverty and was not actually a population theory at all.⁷

But even though we have been exceedingly harsh on Malthus and his outmoded theory, in all fairness we should, perhaps, list the main postulates of his idea and then consider in a little more detail the social conditions in eighteenth century England that gave him his thoughts. Naturally, it would be beyond the scope of this study to attempt to consider all of the social, economic, and political conditions existing in eighteenth century England. Therefore, let us briefly consider the general conditions in England in 1797-98 and specifically the Poor Laws, since these were a matter of great concern to both Malthus and his contemporaries. This brief examination of these two aspects of the problem will enable us to see that the conditions with which Malthus concerned himself have long since disappeared and that his theory should be allowed to rest in peace.

Originally, Malthus' main theory of population held that population cannot increase without a corresponding increase of the means of subsistence. He further contended that population does invariably increase where there are the means of subsistence, and he stated that the history of every people that ever existed would prove his point. To these ideas he later added in the 1826 edition of his *Essay* (as well as in some previous editions) the postulates that, (1) population invariably increases where the means of subsistence increase, unless

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 436-437.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 440-441.

⁵⁷ Buchanan, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

⁵⁸ Discussed by Kerensky in *The Catastrophe*, pp. 239-244.

⁵⁹ Golder, *op. cit.*, p. 471.

⁷ Cf. Reuter, *op. cit.*, E. F. Panrose in his work *Population Theories and Their Applications* sets forth much the same ideas in this regard.

prevented by some very powerful and obvious checks (such as starvation, war, plague, disease, vice, etc.), and (2) these checks, and the checks which repress the superior power of population, and keep its effects on a level with the means of subsistence, are all resolvable into moral restraint, vice and misery.

Of course, there is more to the theory than the foregoing items, such data, for example, as the mathematical proportion that Malthus worked out between the food supply and fecundity; but those other elements do not specifically concern us in this particular study.

When Malthus took his pen in hand in 1797-98, England was in a very distressed and depressed social and economic situation. The Industrial Revolution, which was then in its early stages, had created a seeming surplus of population. Wages were low, the poor rates were high, and there was distress on all sides.

The war with revolutionary France had put a drain on the country and resulted in a general increase in poor relief. Indentured servants were common, and conditions in general were in anything but a smooth state.

During this whole period England, and indeed the whole world, was being subjected to a movement which is still being felt in many of its implications. This was, of course, the Industrial Revolution. To discuss all of its various ramifications would be beyond our present considerations but it must be examined partially inasmuch as it had a direct influence upon Malthus' theory.

The Industrial Revolution brought with it, among other things, a rise in the number of the capitalist manufacturers, and a great increase in the manufacture of cotton. As a matter of actual record the cotton trade tripled itself in a period of fifteen years. Again, numerous changes were made in the woolen industry, in the linen trade, and in the manufacture of lace goods.

Large scale production began in the coal-fields since coal was important not only for manufacturing purposes but for house fuel as well. As new industries were developed these required more quantities of coal; the output in England tripled by the end of the eighteenth century. The commission of 1871 estimated that the increase of coal production in England rose from 2,612,000 tons in 1700 to 4,773,828 tons in 1750. A total of 6,205,400 tons were mined in 1770, and this had increased to 7,618,728 in 1790. By 1795 more than 10,000,000 tons were mined.⁸

Immediately following the increase in coal there was an equal increase in the iron industry, which had been revolutionized by the invention of smelting by pit-coal brought into use between 1740 and 1750 and by the application of the steam engine to blast furnaces in 1788.

Naturally, such an increase in industry and commerce had its effect upon the population. The rate of increase of population in the first half of the eighteenth century was probably never more than 18 per cent but in the second half the rate of increase was 31 per cent. The largest decennial increase before 1751 was 3 per

cent. For each of the next three decennial periods the increase was 6 per cent. Between 1781 and 1791 the increase measured 9 per cent; between 1791 and 1801, 11 per cent; between 1801 and 1811, 14 per cent. The total population of England grew from 7,000,000 in 1760 to 9,216,000 in 1803.⁹

With such a population growth in a period of approximately forty years, it is not hard to see why Malthus and his contemporaries would be doing much thinking along population lines. The unfortunate point, of course, was the fact that Malthus approached the whole problem from a negative point of view; the years that have elapsed since his theory was published have made manifest his short-sightedness.

Perhaps the entire set of conditions existing during the Industrial Revolution during the time that Malthus wrote can be summarized by saying that the immediate effect of this revolution in industry was naturally an enormous increase of production. This production increase resulted in an immense increase in the total wealth of England at an unprecedented rate, and individual incomes also rose rapidly. But while this was occurring there was a progressive and rapid degradation of the standard of life of the workers.

Tickner has rather completely summarized this period of English history when he says:

The Industrial Revolution was not effected without many serious results. The new manufacturers with their rapidly-increasing wealth soon obtained a great deal of influence in politics and in society; influence which had previously belonged almost entirely to the country gentry and landed interest. The mass of the industrial population became wage-earners only, without that interest in their work which the old gild workers, who owned the product of their labour, had had. They suffered also in many ways, especially in the earlier days of the change, for, although the new methods led to greatly increased wealth, they did not always lead to greater comfort and happiness. The old personal relations of employer and employed, which in earlier days had kept master and worker on fairly friendly terms, now disappeared in many cases. Production on a large scale for distant markets led to periods of unemployment, and at times to lessened wages. The people were clustered together in large and smoky towns where they could not add anything to their incomes by work in agriculture, while the lack of sanitation resulted in much disease. It was not until the second half of the nineteenth century that a reaction against these evils led to better conditions of life and of labour for many of our working population.¹⁰

While Mr. Tickner's summarization of this period might at first reading seem to agree somewhat with what Malthus contended, one must remember the last statement of the quotation. During the last half of the nineteenth century there was a reaction against these evils that led to better conditions of life and of labor for many of the English working population.

Therein was the answer to much of Malthus' theorizing. Bound by the narrow confines of his own material world, Malthus failed to realize that conditions could be improved within a relatively short space of time because man had growing dominion over matter. Malthus failed to realize that there were vast expanses of arable land in Africa, Asia, South America and elsewhere that could be put under cultivation to feed the increasing population. Then, too, he failed to realize that man's native genius would find methods of agriculture

⁸ Cf. F. W. Tickner, *A Social and Industrial History of England* (London, 1915).

⁹ Cf. Arnold Toynbee, *Lectures on the Industrial Revolution of the Eighteenth Century in England* (London).

¹⁰ Tickner, *op. cit.*, pp. 538-9.

that would increase the yield of the soil and thus provide more food for increasing populations. But, basically, every schoolboy now knows the falsehood of Malthus' theory and little time need be spent here in pointing out all the answers to its fundamental errors. The whole purpose of this particular study is further to minimize whatever effect the theory may still have by pointing out its relatively insignificant beginnings with the strong suggestion that it be permanently relegated to the more obscure pages of our history books.

However, there is one other item that should be considered before closing our consideration. That matter concerns the Poor Laws which were of great concern to Malthus and his contemporaries and helped in the formulation of the theory.

The consideration of the Poor Laws can be made conveniently by dividing it into three main periods: from 1349 to 1601, from 1601 to 1782 and from 1782 to 1834. From 1349 to 1601 all forms of poverty in England were treated severely by the government in its futile effort to wipe out poverty and pauperism by strict legislation.

As an example of the punitive measures employed by Parliament in this period we see that in the year 1531 the impotent poor had to be licensed to beg and that sturdy beggars were to be put in stocks or whipped and then returned to their own localities. In 1536, the beggars returned to their native towns were kept at public expense, and if able, made to work. In 1547 Parliament made slavery the penalty for begging. When these methods did not eliminate the practice, Parliament next attempted to deal with the matter on a nation-wide basis. In 1576 an Act ordered Houses of Correction to be erected in every country.

These were but some of the early Poor Laws, and in the Great Act of 1597 which was completed and confirmed in 1601, control of the relief of the poor was placed in the hands of the church wardens of the parish and four overseers. The Act further ordered that poor children were to be set to work or apprenticed; hospitals for the impotent were to be built on waste land; funds were to be levied on the district; and all beggars, except those begging in their own parish, were to be classed as rogues.

In the second period matters continued in this same manner; for in 1722 Justices of the Peace were forbidden to order relief without consulting the overseers, and by the same Act it was provided that the overseers might purchase or hire a house for the maintenance and employment of the poor. In this same act of 1722 it was ruled that a parish possessing a workhouse might offer to receive the poor of another parish, and that, wherever such an institution was available, the names of the poor who refused to enter it should be struck off the roll. As the result of this Act many workhouses were established; ten years later there were said to be about fifty in London and sixty throughout England.¹¹

Thus, the English people were well aware for several centuries of the existence of a poor class as a distinct

national problem. The foregoing enumeration of some of the laws passed to regulate the poor and to avert the menace of pauperism shows to some extent that the problem had been recognized.

Gradually Parliament realized that poverty was a condition that could not be cured by imprisonment, beating, and, in severe cases, hanging beggars, as was done in the 1500's. Rather, something had to be done to get at the roots of poverty to see if it could not, at least, be alleviated since it seemed incapable of permanent cure. A change had partially come over the minds of the landowners as to their relations with the people. In addition to unthinking and ignorant benevolence, there slowly arose a sentiment that admitted an unconditional right on the part of the poor to an indefinite share in the national wealth, but the right was complied with in such a way as to keep them in dependence and to diminish their self-respect. Although the French Revolution brought about a certain panic in England, the idea of bribing the people into passiveness was not absolutely new as witness Gilbert's Act of 1782 which abolished the workhouse test, and provided work for those who were willing to be employed near their own places of residence.

But even Gilbert's Act failed to alleviate the sufferings of the poor, and in 1795 some Berkshire Justices, meeting in Quarter Sessions at Speenhamland, declared that the state of the poor required that more assistance be given to them. They realized that the violent fluctuations in prices made it impossible to fix wages, so they made an allowance, based on the price of bread, to every family in proportion to its numbers.

Furthermore, they gave the unanimous opinion that the state of the poor required them to have further assistance than had been generally given to them. Therefore, deeming it unwise to regulate wages according to the old statutes of Elizabeth and James, they recommended that farmers and others raise the pay of laborers in proportion to the present price of provisions. The judges ruled that if the farmers refused to grant such a pay increase they would make an allowance to every poor family in proportion to its numbers. They stated what they thought was necessary for a man and his wife and children, and this amount was to be produced either by his own and his family's labor or an allowance from the poor-rates.

Obviously, under such a system of allowances population increased very rapidly. But with a rise in population came another great rise in pauperism. As evidence of this it can be seen that the average charge for the years 1748, 49, and 50 had been 689,971 pounds, but by 1783-5 it had increased almost three times. In 1812 the increase in the cost of pauperism had risen approximately ten times, as the total was 6,656,105 pounds.¹²

This then, briefly, was the history of the Poor Laws in England at the time Malthus wrote his theory. It has been necessary to present the history in a somewhat detailed fashion in order to bring us up to the year

¹¹ Cf. Charlotte M. Waters, *An Economic History of England, 1066-1874* (London, 1928).

¹² Cf. W. Cunningham, *The Growth of English Industry and Commerce in Modern Times* (Cambridge, 1892).

1796, the year in which William Pitt, then Prime Minister, decided to do something to relieve the distress of the poor. For Pitt, though . . .

he now ignored the need of reform could not overlook the existence of distress. In 1795 there had been a serious scarcity; war prices had become famine prices. It was the year when 'the lower orders' were held down by special coercion acts; it was the year when the king's carriage was stopped by a mob crying, 'Bread, bread!' Mr. Whitbread and the rest thought Parliament ought to 'do something'; and Pitt proposed (1796) to meet the difficulty by amending the Poor Laws. His bill proposed 'to restore the original purity of the Poor Laws' by modifying the law of settlement of the direction of greater freedom, and by assisting the working man in other ways. One of these other ways was an attempt of a harmless kind to found schools of industry, another to attach every labourer to a friendly society. But another less innocently proposed was to encourage the growth of population by making the poor relief greater where the family was larger. 'Let us make relief,' in such cases, 'a matter of right and honour, instead of a ground for opprobrium and contempt. This will make a large family a blessing and not a curse; and this will draw a proper line of distinction between those who are to provide for themselves by their labour, and those who, after enriching their country with a number of children, have a claim upon its assistance for their support.'¹³

It was this bill of Pitt's that was the fuel that ignited the flames of Malthus' wrath, at least in regard to the Poor Laws. Malthus then attacked the whole system of Poor Laws in his *Essay* when he said the Laws "with their indiscriminate doles and bonuses on large families, actively encourage an excessive increase among the poorest of the population, and so made the poverty worse than before . . . I feel little doubt, in my own mind, that if the poor laws had never existed, though there might have been a few more instances of very severe distress, yet that the aggregate mass of happiness among the common people would have been much greater than it is at present."¹⁴

In Malthus' opinion the only radical cure for the distress at the time (1798) in which war, famine, and poverty were vying for the upper hand in England, the only solution was a restriction on the immense increase in the population; it had been over two million from 1760 to 1798. Malthus suggested, however, that for the relief of the immediate stress three palliatives might be tried:

1. All the existing parish laws, and in particular the laws of settlement, should be swept away. "This would at any rate give liberty and freedom of action to the peasantry of England, which they can hardly be said to possess at present."

2. "Premiums should be given for turning up fresh land, and all possible encouragements held out to agriculture above manufacturers and to tillage above grazing"—a policy which had much to be said for it at a time when there was no prospect of getting large supplies of food from abroad.

3. For cases of extreme distress country workhouses should be established. "The fare should be hard, and those that were able, obliged to work . . . They should not be considered as comfortable asylums . . . but merely places where severe distress might find some alleviation."¹⁵

These, then, were the three solutions that Malthus offered as a relief from the oppression of the Poor Laws. It was, therefore, from this line of reasoning that he derived his pessimistic philosophy that has come down to us today as Malthus' "Law", namely, that population cannot increase without the means of subsistence and that population does invariably increase where there are the means of subsistence.

¹³ Bonar, *op. cit.*, pp. 29-30.

¹⁴ Thomas Robert Malthus, *An Essay on Population* (London), p. iv.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. ix.

Today, of course, we know that Malthus was wrong. But even if he were right in his supposition, if humanity were to starve for lack of enough food, even then what ear could we lend to his voice? The answer is, absolutely none; for both law and reason are, by their natures, binding. One cannot sin against nature without maiming reason. Therefore, those who would still give ear to Malthus' false doctrines would be doing nothing but contributing to man's eventual downfall.

This study then has been presented in an honest attempt to show how absolutely little significance or importance the Malthusian theory of population can hold for us today. By showing its obscure origins as a mere argument in a family forensic contest, it is hoped that its true value will not be over-emphasized. By constantly bearing in mind its humble beginnings and realizing that the conditions of which Malthus wrote are no longer true in our modern world in regard to our basic progress since Malthus' time, we can dismiss the man and the theory with little future thought.

In conclusion, we can, perhaps, best summarize the truly insignificant worth of Malthus and his theory by referring to a statement of G. P. Gooch: "Whatever else may be said of the worth of Malthus' we owe him the honor of placing him among those individuals who have contributed something to future generations by showing how the generations of which they were a part operated. For this service, if none other, we are indebted to him."

Unique Library

(Continued from page thirty-two)

Franklin Delano Roosevelt; the list might be extended for several pages to include a host of others, famous in the public and academic life of our country, both past and present.

The staff, currently under the direction of Dr. Clarence S. Brigham, director since 1930, numbers fifteen in all. Of the fifteen, seven are classified as professional employees, three are engaged at tasks of a clerical nature, two are rated as pages, two are binders and, of course, there is the ever-necessary janitor. The members of this staff maintain the collections, handle several thousand correspondence inquiries annually and provide the materials requested by visitors to the library.

One might well be accused of understatement in making the remark that the American Antiquarian Society is a treasure-house for those interested in the historical lore of the Americas. Truly, to employ the terminology of the modern social worker, this unique library is a cultural charitable bureau dispensing volumes of American history to those seeking information. Robert W. G. Vail, formerly librarian at the Antiquarian, has expressed the same thought in a slightly different manner. Addressing the historians of today in the foreword of his work, *A Guide to the Resources of the American Antiquarian Society*, the writer concludes with the brief but inviting observation, "Any aid that we can give is yours for the asking."

Book Reviews

St. Augustine, *The First Catechetical Instruction* [*De Catechizandis Rudibus*], translated and annotated by the Rev. Joseph P. Christopher. Westminster, Maryland. The Newman Bookshop. 1946. pp. 171. \$2.50

St. Augustine, *Faith, Hope and Charity* [*Enchiridion*], translated and annotated by the Very Rev. Louis A. Arand, S. S. Westminster, Maryland. The Newman Bookshop. 1947. pp. 165. \$2.50

The writings of St. Augustine of Hippo have never been completely translated into English. Of the works which are in English, most have been translated by non-Catholic scholars. For many years, the need has been felt for accurate English versions with sufficient annotation to bring out the relations of this Father of the Church with the historical traditions of the Catholic Church. It would seem that we are now well on the way toward a realization of this objective in this country. Two large series of translations from the Fathers have lately been inaugurated under the auspices of American Catholic scholars. One series is called the *Fathers of the Church* and is being published from New York, under the direction of Dr. Ludwig Schopp. *Ancient Christian Writers* is the title of the other series. It is edited by Fathers J. Quasten and J. C. Plumpe of the Catholic University of America. While it is unfortunate in some ways that there is some duplication of effort, between these two series, perhaps the competition will be a spur to better scholarship. The present two volumes are numbers two and three of the A. C. W. series.

Father Christopher had published a noteworthy version of the treatise *De Catechizandis Rudibus* in 1926. He now offers a revision of his original work. The Latin text is not included but the translator used the Benedictine edition as a base, with a few emendations. Father Christopher accepts the date A. D. 405, proposed by Wundt. The fact is that a large number of works were dated circa 400 by the Benedictine editors (including this treatise), and it is still very difficult to determine their chronological sequence. Part One of this work deals with the principles of catechesis and the second part gives two examples of the use of Augustine's methods. Since it is quite true that upon this treatise, "are based almost all subsequent works of catechetics" (Intro., p. 8), it is obvious that this readable translation can be of great use to teachers of "religion" courses in Catholic schools. The type of instruction which Augustine had in mind was that given normally to adult catechumens preparing for baptism, but the point which he labors throughout is that all such teaching should be adapted to ability of the learner. Augustine did not think it very useful for the student to memorize long formulae filled with big words, incomprehensible to the uninitiated. Of course, this treatise is of broader appeal than its title indicates. Much of Augustine's practical psychology and theory of knowledge is foreshadowed in it.

The *Enchiridion* on Faith, Hope and Charity is also a primary religious work. Shortly after the year 420, Augustine was requested to make a brief outline of the truths of the Catholic Faith and he chose to do this under the headings of the three theological virtues. In so doing, he established a method much used in mediæval times (cf. St. Thomas Aquinas, *Compendium Theologiae*.) As Father Arand remarks in his brief introduction (p. 5), certain points of doctrine are barely mentioned, or little emphasized, by St. Augustine (the Mass, the Redemption, the full field of Christian charity), but biographers know that Augustine was very busy with his episcopal duties at the time of writing. The wonder is that he was able to find time to write the treatise.

Neither translation is accompanied by the Latin text; it is not planned to include the original texts in either series of Patristic translations. The ideal situation would have been to print one series with the Latin, accompanied by copious notes, and the other series in English only, with a minimum of notes adapted to the popular reader. However that may be, students of the Fathers of the Church may now be assured that they will have, within a few years, usable translations of the entire patristic corpus.

Saint Louis University.

VERNON J. BOURKE.

The Great Elector, by Ferdinand Schevill. Chicago. The University of Chicago Press. 1947. pp. ix, 442. \$5.00

Frederick the Great, the Ruler, the Writer, the Man, by G. P. Gooch. New York. Alfred A. Knopf. 1947. pp. xiii, 376. \$5.00

Twice in our generation the German nation has come dangerously close to military victory and to subjecting the European continent to its power. Many attempts have been made to explain this phenomenon, and it has become obvious that Germany's past contributed much towards the formation of a Hitlerite Germany. Moreover, it is indisputable that Germany of the twentieth century drew its inspiration not so much from its founder, Bismarck, the Iron Chancellor, as from Frederick the Great who raised Prussia to the level of a great European power. Without Frederick there would have been no Bismarck who required a preponderant Prussia for his far-reaching aims, and without the Iron Chancellor there could hardly have been a Hitler and a Third Reich. Frederick, however, was not the builder of the Prussian state. When he assumed power in 1740 he inherited a well-trained army, a full treasury and an efficient bureaucracy from his father, the irascible Frederick William I, who, by avoiding war, had built up the state according to the model set down by the real founder of modern Prussia, Frederick William, the Elector of Brandenburg, the Great Elector.

Two noted historians of the Modern European scene here present biographies of the two rulers who shaped the history of Prussia. Schevill's book is about a prince

—the story of a statesman—who founded a state within the European and German framework of the second half of the seventeenth century. In order to understand the work, the statesmanship and accomplishments of the Great Elector, the author has devoted the greater portion of his book to an examination of the times and the milieu in which Frederick William operated. They were troublous times. When Frederick William ascended the throne in 1640 he inherited parcels of land scattered across northern Europe from Poland to the Rhine, wherein the Elector's authority was more theoretical than actual. Moreover, these lands, being battlegrounds of the nations contending in the Thirty Years' War, were ravaged by war and occupied in part by powerful enemies. Frederick William's efforts and successes in liberating these lands, in consolidating the scattered domains, in making his authority effective, in reconstructing his ravaged country, while at the same time participating in the wars of Central Europe, have earned for him the title of "Great". By the time he died after 48 years of effort, Brandenburg-Prussia had supplanted Saxony as the leading Protestant power in Germany and had become a worthy rival of Austria in the Holy Roman Empire.

In presenting the story of the Great Elector, Schevill has not added anything new or original to historical knowledge. His work is not so much a biography as a bird's-eye view of later seventeenth-century Germany in which the Great Elector plays the most prominent part. His avowed purpose is not to write a historical monograph, but a historical work combining art and scholarship which would appeal to the broad community of cultivated men and women. He has succeeded in presenting a scholarly, readable work, but one wonders whether his effort to be artistic does not effect his scholarship, for in his endeavor at readability he often tends toward generality. Although Schevill is a good historian, he is not as good an artist, for his prose often tends toward verbosity and his phrasing is at times not clear. In addition the following can be pointed out for correction: the Treaty of Verdun was signed in 843, not 834 (p. 22); reflection is misspelled (p. 422); the phrase "the elector agreed to advocate of the Twenty-Year Truce" needs re-wording (p. 354). Further, Schevill's sympathy for the Calvinist or Reformed belief of the Great Elector is evident, and although he is entitled to the sympathy, as an historian it would be better for him to avoid phrases like "incurably diseased papacy" (p. 69) and "Lutheran chuckleheads" (p. 251).

Where Schevill has tried to paint an over-all panorama of Frederick William and his times, Gooch goes in the opposite direction and tries to analyze the character, the friendship and ideology of Frederick the Great rather than to write a full-scale biography of his subject. The well-known English historian believes that the immense political and military achievements of Frederick II which catapulted Prussia into the ranks of a great power and paved the way for a united Germany under Prussian leadership, have tended to overshadow his activities as a writer, a thinker and a correspondent.

Relying upon the many volumes of the Prussian king's literary, political and historical writings, upon his personal and political correspondence, as well as upon the testimony of those who came in contact with the king, Gooch has let the sources themselves speak. Through the words of Frederick and such correspondents as his sister Wilhelmina, his brother Prince Henry and the noted Voltaire, there emerges a picture not only of a master strategist and statesman, but also of a thinker and a writer, of a lonely man, unloved and unloving.

Dr. Gooch concludes his study with an excellent chapter entitled "Through German Eyes" in which he spot-lights the niche which Frederick has occupied in German national tradition and the idealization which his actions have received from German historians. Concerning Frederick's influence upon the generations that followed, the author very cogently remarks, "The mind and face of Europe today would be very different had he not made Prussia a great power and popularized aggression by his spectacular success."

Both books are recommended for students of Modern Europe and especially for those who wish to gain a greater understanding of Modern Germany. With Robert Ergang's biography on King Frederick William I, *The Potsdam Fuhrer*, we now have an excellent trilogy on the three rulers of Brandenburg-Prussia who progressively raised their land from political, social, economic and cultural decadence to the position of a great European state.

Saint Louis University. ANTHONY F. CZAJKOWSKI.

Humanist as Hero: The Life of Sir Thomas More, by Theodore Maynard. New York. Macmillan. 1947. pp. 261. \$3.00

A biography of the immensely able, many-sided man whom G. K. Chesterton regarded as "the greatest historical character in English history" almost of necessity attracts attention. Peerless he stands against the background of the court of Macchiavelli's *Prince* as the incorruptible lawyer, the talented wit, the supremely happy family man, the brilliant humanist who believed that "Christianity was no less true because Paganism was so beautiful," the author of one of the world's great books, the Speaker of the House of Commons, the Lord Chancellor of England and finally the martyr who died in defense of the faith and of the church, protesting that he died the King's good servant but God's first. One has only to catch a glimpse of Holbein's familiar portrait of More to call to mind the phenomenal career of this truly *uomo universale*. It is, however, quite natural to expect that like other happy historical characters such as John Henry Newman, William Ewart Gladstone or Abraham Lincoln, More should be the subject of biography to the point where overlapping becomes unavoidable and the danger of even stereotyping the issue presents itself. Yet although Maynard in his *Humanist as Hero* leans heavily on Professor R. W. Chambers' recent outstanding life of More, his book cannot be classified either as a "begat" or as a popularization. It is rather a lucid reinterpretation of the facts cogently, if somewhat popularly, presented. It reveals

considerable research, penetrating insight, sympathetic understanding and admirable balance on the author's part.

Perhaps the worst defect of the book is its title. *Humanist as Saint* would have been more significant as well as more apropos for this is the central theme of the book. More's humanism, as the author points out, led him directly to sanctity in the old and supposedly corrupt Church because he never lost sight of the most human fact about man, namely that he is "a God in ruins." And while humanism thought of itself as an integration of the whole personality and aimed at a universality of knowledge directed to a single end, that end for More was God and the full integration of the personality of fallen man impossible until he is with God. That was why in addition to rounding himself out as a relatively perfect human being, More never failed to wear his hair shirt or contemplate upon the Four Last Things. His humanism gives the lie to the later effort of would-be scholars to equate the "New Learning" with Protestantism.

Maynard's book is not entirely free from errors. For instance, he seems to feel that More held the position that a General Council was superior even to the Pope. The only reason for this statement is that when the King spoke of appealing from the Pope to a General Council on the divorce issue More wished him "comfortable speed." One can almost see More shrugging his shoulders as we do in American fashion when we tell a man who is determined to do the impossible to "go to it, boy." More could not have been ignorant of the Bull *Execrabilis*, of 1460, in which Pius II had exploded the Conciliar theory.

Saint Louis University

THOMAS L. COONAN.

Man and the State, by William Ebenstein. New York. Rinehart and Co. 1947. pp. xvi, 781. \$5.00

For some time teachers of political theory have been questioning the efficacy of the purely chronological approach to their subject matter. To many of them a functional approach appeared to offer greater advantages from the viewpoint of both the student and the instructor. For these latter Professor Ebenstein's book may be found to fill a serious need.

Great issues, rather than particular periods in history or particular individuals, are made the focus of attention and organization. Furthermore, the author adheres to the notion that the most direct way of acquainting oneself with the statements of fruitful political ideas is to go back to the great writers themselves; hence the content of the book is largely taken up with excerpts from the writings of selected theorists. Each chapter is, however, prefaced with a brief introductory essay by Professor Ebenstein, with a view to explaining the nature of the problem to be dealt with, as well as placing the writers and their ideas in the appropriate historical setting and perspective.

The book is subdivided into four parts: "The Foundations of Democracy," "Antidemocratic Thought," "Capitalism, Socialism, Planning," and "From Nationalism to World Order." The basic purpose of the com-

pilation is said to be to present the major ideas that have animated the political thinking of the Western world in the modern age. Nevertheless, by far the larger part of the specific selections can only be described as very recent. Hobbes and Locke are included, but only very briefly. No space whatever is accorded St. Thomas Aquinas, or any other representative of scholastic thought. Of course, in any book of selections such as this, it is not possible to include a sufficient variety to satisfy every reader. Even so, it would seem to this reviewer that some great thinkers who have been excluded, as for example, Suarez, or Grotius, or Pope Leo XIII, have been more influential in the moulding of modern political ideas than some who have been included, as for example Malinowski, or Fromm, or Benda. In fairness to the author, it should be added that he has not "clung slavishly to well-known names." His first consideration has been, in his own words, "readability and freshness of thought and expression." In the main, it appears that he has succeeded in meeting these criteria. At least for reference, his book can be recommended.

Saint Louis University.

PAUL G. STEINBICKER.

A Select Bibliography of the History of the Catholic Church in the United States, by John Tracy Ellis. New York. Declan X. McMullen. 1947. pp. 96.

This is a useful compilation of material on the history of Catholicism in the United States done by a competent scholar. Its 775 titles cover the whole period of our history, from 1492 to the present.

The work is well organized so that it is easy to find desired items. A listing here of the main divisions will give an idea of the scope and method of the project: I. Guides, II. Archival Centers, III. General Works, IV. Colonial Periods 1491-1788, V. Middle Period 1789-1866, VI. Later Period 1866-1946, VII. Periodicals, VIII. Catholic Historical Societies.

As the title indicates, there is no attempt to include all possible materials, yet the important writings on the history of the Church in the United States are included. Of course, not all of the works cited are of equal value, for there are listed recognized authoritative histories, doctoral dissertations (published and unpublished), and popular books.

In many instances there is an accompanying brief appraisal but very often such estimates are lacking. It would be quite helpful if the compiler had had the time to give a critique of more of the titles. The mere statement, "A Ph. D. dissertation" is not of much assistance; in fact, it almost seems a mild form of condemnation.

Father Ellis does not restrict his work to ecclesiastical titles but also includes pertinent general works, e. g., several volumes from the History of American Life series. These are welcome additions for anyone desiring to form a complete and integrated picture of the Church in our country.

This bibliography will be welcomed by teachers, librarians, and directors of dissertations. Its brevity and conciseness will make it a handy work for reference.

Saint Louis University.

GREGORY C. HUGER.

An Introduction to the Papers of the New York Prize Court, 1861-1865, by Madeline Russell Robinton. New York. Columbia University Press. 1945. pp. 203. \$2.75

This monograph, presented as Number 515 of the Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, is, obviously, of little interest to the casual reader or to the general historian. However, like many monographs, it does an excellent job of filling a small niche in a particularized field of American history and in giving detailed information of definite interest to specialists in a certain phase of history.

Dr. Robinton has examined thoroughly a collection of governmental records—files of cases of ships seized for attempted violation of the blockade during the Civil War—which were inventoried after 1936 as a part of the survey of records of federal agencies in New York City. These papers are now reproduced on microfilm by the library of Columbia University.

Obviously the principal source for this study was the actual ships' records seized and the decisions of the prize courts of New York. These records contained a wealth of information on cargoes carried and on the general management of ships during the Civil War, which might well be useful to an economic historian interested particularly in seafaring commerce. Of interest to the student of law are the records of court proceedings and the organization and operation of the prize courts.

The volume is neat in appearance, voluminously footnoted, and generally free from mechanical errors.

Saint Louis University. JASPER W. CROSS, JR.

The United States: American Democracy in World Perspective, by Ray Allen Billington, Bert James Loewenberg and Samuel Hugh Brockunier. New York. Rinehart & Co., Inc. 1947. pp. xviii, 894. \$5.00

In the struggle to eradicate nationalism from national histories, it is necessary to return to the basic matter of history, Man, for a universally valid orientation. This book offers a synthesis of our history as a "story of man in America." Its presentation does more than place man in America in world perspective, it "accepts the responsibility for positive affirmation of those courses of action which the guideposts of social science indicate as valid." Here is history written as an "act of faith" in things working themselves out in one way rather than another. As a result of this view of history, the story of the past is presented in terms of things to be done now and the solutions to present problems as seen by the authors.

In view of the authors, national, responsible party government is the essential basis for democratic government; but democracy means more than political freedom, justice and equality, it extends to social and economic freedom, equality and justice as well. Much is made of the struggle for social and economic freedom especially in the years during which this has become central to the political battles of our day. Approaching the past with the solution of such problems as the object has both advantages and disadvantages. Methods which the past found valid are seen to be inadequate to meet the

pressing problems of today. Yet by making the present the determining factor in the past, it is submitted that we do not see the past as it really was, and are prone to be over-harsh for the failure of the past to appreciate problems which were not problems then. At least a third of the book is given over to the years from the end of the Civil War to the turn of the century, and the account of that era is particularly notable for the virtues and faults just described. An adequate amount of space is here devoted to the period which was the birthplace of modern America, but perhaps too much time is spent in condemning the sins of those thoughtless years.

The book has a list of readings in support of the authors' thesis; I saw no citations contra. Also appended are a series of documents and tables supplying data not always readily available. The text is liberally supplied with graphs and charts.

Saint Louis University.

R. W. MCCLUGGAGE.

American Sea Power Since 1775, by Allen Westcott et al. Chicago. J. B. Lippincott Co. 1947. pp. viii, 609. \$5.00

Professor Westcott, with other members of the faculty of the United States Naval Academy, has brought the history of our navy up to date and added a new perspective to its study. This history of naval development from the first man-o-war of 1775 to the fleets off Leyte is the first such work to relegate the American naval wars of the past to the minor position that they deserve in comparison with the greatest sea war of all time, viz., the Second World War. About forty per cent of the book is devoted to the last decade and necessarily lacks complete, detailed coverage due to the proximity of the events. The more remote activities are adequately developed—especially commendable is the treatment of the Civil War.

Sandwiched within the work are three chapters that alone equal the value of the remaining content and add the new perspective to naval affairs. Herein, the civilian will find an explanation of the principles of naval strategy of all ages. The problems of world geography, war strategy, logistics, sea power, life lines and bases are so presented that the reader's understanding of the global, "triphibious" war of today is increased a hundredfold.

Disregarding the eulogistic tenor of the book, it is suitable for a textbook where naval history is taught. However, since this is rarely included in the average college curriculum, the value will be greater as a source of information to the teacher and follower of world affairs.

Saint Louis University.

DANIEL J. REED.

The South During Reconstruction, 1865-1877, by E. Merton Coulter. Baton Rouge. Louisiana State University Press. 1947. pp. xii, 426. Trade edition, \$5.00

This volume is the first published of a ten-volume series collectively entitled *A History of the South*, edited by Wendell Holmes Stephenson, Professor of Southern History and Chairman of the Social Science Division

of the Tulane University, and E. Merton Coulter, Professor of History at the University of Georgia. Sponsors of the series are Louisiana State University, at whose press the volumes will be prepared, and the Trustees of the Littlefield Fund for Southern History at the University of Texas. Originally each of these two sponsors had planned to produce histories of the South but, finding their undertakings essentially in harmony, merged their projects. The late Charles W. Ramsdell, Professor of American History at the University of Texas, was, with Stephenson, originally designated as co-editor of the series. On his death, Professor Coulter was named to succeed him.

Since this volume is the first of the series to appear, a word about the other projected volumes seems in place. These works, as they appear, will cover Southern history through the seventeenth and eighteenth century colonial periods, the American Revolution, and the early period of the American nation. The development of Southern sectionalism, 1819-1848, and the growth of Southern nationalism, 1848-1861, and the period of the Confederacy, 1861-1865, will complete the era before that covered by the present volume. The last two volumes in the series will deal with the origins of the "New South," 1877-1913, and "The Present South," 1913-1946. Authors of the individual volumes include Wesley Frank Craven, Philip Davidson, Philip M. Hamer, Thomas P. Abernethy, Charles S. Sydnor, Avery O. Craven, C. Vann Woodward, Rupert B. Vance, and Professor Coulter, who will also write the volume on the period of the Confederate States of America.

With these editors and authors, the project should be capably planned and written and should constitute a real addition to the field of Southern history. On the evidence offered by the first volume published, this promise seems likely to be fulfilled.

Professor Coulter announces his purpose is not that of detailing the process of reconstruction in the South but that of describing the South during reconstruction, "with all the political and constitutional abnormalities of the times, the ordinary activities of the people, as they sowed and reaped, went to church, visited their neighbors, sung their songs, and sought in a thousand ways to amuse themselves." In order to accomplish this, the author has included three chapters dealing with cultural developments, fashions and recreation, and schools and churches, as well as four chapters covering new economic horizons, agricultural reorganization transportation, and cities and factories.

However, the actual process of reconstruction has not, by any means, been omitted; nearly half of the volume is devoted to discussing the efforts of the Radicals to carry out their program and to the effects of these endeavors. At first glance, this section would seem to be overly critical, if such be possible, of the Reconstruction program. However, when the purpose of the author is remembered—to indicate the attitude of the South itself—this seeming bias is explained and justified.

The principal sources used for the book appear to be contemporary newspapers of the South. No complete

bibliography of these is given although the author indicates that he has sampled newspapers of all shades of opinion in the eleven Southern states. This claim appears justified. Manuscript collections seem to have been used much less than newspapers, probably because of the author's claim that "what public opinion was and what it demanded can nowhere else be established so clearly as through this medium." Along with this and other source materials as pamphlets and periodicals, the field of secondary works seems to be sufficiently investigated.

The physical appearance of the book, which will appear in both trade and library editions, is excellent. The type face and paper are attractive and the typography and proofreading are unusually good.

Saint Louis University. JASPER W. CROSS, JR.

Pontiac and the Indian Uprising, by Howard H. Peckham. Princeton. Princeton University Press. 1947. pp. xviii, 436. \$4.50

Here is one occasion on which the publisher's praise of a book is justified. This is a well written book by a scholarly author who knows his subject. To write a careful account of Pontiac and the uprising is no simple task, as those of us interested in the period are too well aware. But the author of this work has done a fine service to the whole episode. Mr. Peckham declares in his preface that he wishes, in as far as possible to write a biography of Pontiac. In the ordinary sense of the word, this book is not a true biography for such a production is not wholly possible. But the book is a penetrating analysis of Pontiac and his times, a study which has not been previously accomplished. The author knows his field and what is better, he understands it. He makes no outstanding errors which this reviewer noticed. He writes well, not always with the same verve, but consistently well. Some of the chapters are most detailed and will be found tiring to those whose special interest is not this field. But for those who delve into things colonial, especially into the subject of inter-colonial rivalries, this is a fascinating book. It does not appear that the author has neglected any source of information in his research. This is a fine piece of scholarship which deserves praise.

Saint Louis University. JOSEPH P. DONNELLY.

Pedro De Valdivia, Conquistador of Chile, by Ida Stevenson Weldon Vernon. Austin. The University of Texas Press. 1946. pp. 103. \$2.25

Fascinating and fantastic creatures, these Spanish *conquistadores*! One never tires of hearing their story, but, unfortunately, the story of many of them is rarely told, in form, at least, as to be accessible by an English-speaking public. In gathering together the scattered bits of the story of Pedro de Valdivia, Mrs. Vernon has rendered a very real service. He was one of the greatest of the breed who has deserved far more recognition than the past has accorded him, again as far as English-speaking readers are concerned. His role as the founder of Chile has merited him due recognition by historians of his country and from Spanish and Latin American

writers and scholars, but he has long needed a biographer in English. (Cunningham Graham leaves much to be desired.) Now he can no longer be classed among the "forgotten men" of the Latin American past.

The author has used the works of her predecessors very judiciously and has carefully and thoroughly probed the considerable amount of contemporary material to bring her hero into relief. The result is a quite appealing character, a man of courage, action, and decision, who had to face not only the problems of opening up a new country against the determined opposition of the natives, who finally did him to death after the defeat at Tucapel, but had also to contend with disloyal fellow countrymen, envious of his position and prestige and continually plotting to remove him, by violence if necessary. Pero Sancho de Hoz is the villain of the piece; Señora Inés de Suárez, "the conqueror's lady," the heroine; and other important Chilean pioneers are met along the way. This study proves that scholarship and interesting writing need not be incompatibles.

There is one criticism which this reviewer would offer. The lack of an index rather seriously detracts from the otherwise real excellence of the book.

Saint Louis University.

JOHN F. BANNON.

Canada, a Political and Social History, by Edgar McInnis. New York. Rinehart & Company. 1947. pp. 574. \$5.00

This masterful textbook, written by a native Canadian, is a welcome contribution to a none too well known but vitally interesting field of historical research. As a penetrating study in political and social survival it should be of considerable value to the student of history in general. It supersedes Professor Carl F. Wittke's *History of Canada* written in 1933 which strangely enough is not included in the bibliography. The author's well-balanced account of the interacting factors of economics, politics and geography, of the traditions and aspirations and of the national unity and sectional diversity which form the complex pattern of the Dominion might be used as a headline by some of our own less broadly cultured and duller American historians in revising their accounts of that great political entity of the North American continent, the United States.

Throughout the book the author stresses the constant effort of patience and compromise, the twin virtues of necessity, to reconcile the divergent strains inherent in Canada's structure and to harmonize the clashing forces within a united and independent community. This process has given "a unique character" to the Canadian achievement, the essential drama of which lies in the patient evolution of successive compromises in politics and government. Time and again Canada has been faced with the gravest dilemmas in her internal and external affairs. Yet on each occasion Canadians have turned from extreme courses to seek a middle-road policy on which cooperation was possible and outside of which lay disaster. The chapters dealing with the impact of American "manifest destiny" on Canadian independence, and those treating of the "Age of Laurier" graphically

analyse the striking degree to which the quality of moderation has been applied in Canadian affairs.

The book is not without its faults even though they are minor ones. The very fine illustrations might be better distributed. The author's bias occasionally shows up. In treating of the expulsion of the Acadians his facile justification of English policy is that had the roles been reversed France would not have tolerated the Acadians as long as the English did. This seems to overlook the fact that the English policy of plantations in Ireland was without parallel in Western Europe in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The author also seems to get over the more humane policy of France toward the Indians too easily. He attributes it to the fact that the Indians set more value on English articles of commerce and that this compelled the French to make up the difference by more humane treatment.

The book includes a classified bibliography of some 170 well-selected items. The index is separated into topics, proper names and countries. The preface presents the argument synthetically and reveals in advance the generally high quality of the work.

Saint Louis University.

THOMAS L. COONAN.

Book Notices

The Lance of Longinus, by Prince Hubertus zu Loewenstein. New York. Macmillan. 1946. pp. 166. \$2.00

The Eagle and the Cross, by Prince Hubertus zu Loewenstein. New York. Macmillan. 1947. pp. 280. \$2.75

Together with the same author's *The Child and the Emperor* these two novels complete a trilogy which tells the story of Christ, His death, and some of the early vicissitudes of the Christians. Thrown against a sound historical background the characters bring to life times which were full of excitement and pregnant with significance for the future. This trilogy should be very popular in the secondary school library, interesting reading for the student of history at work on the early period of Christianity and of the Roman Empire.

God's Ambassador, St. Bridget of Sweden, by Helen M. D. Redpath. Milwaukee. Bruce. 1947. pp. 216. \$3.00

Though sometimes the fact is overlooked, saints are people and often very important historical people. Bridget of Sweden was one such. Her name is closely linked with some of the most significant events of Europe's troubled fourteenth century, when Christendom's head had strayed from Rome to a safer but not always so spiritually healthy an Avignon. The author follows her from Sweden down to turbulent and distracted Rome and shows her as one of the most influential women of her age. The last section of the book is devoted to the story of her legacy, the Bridgettine Order, through centuries of trial and triumph. The work is carefully documented throughout and as such merits the attention of the historian, and not merely that of the devout or the devoted.

Blessed Margaret Clitherow, by Margaret T. Monro. New York and Toronto. Longmans, Green and Co. 1947. pp. 108. \$2.00

Margaret Clitherow of York was one of several hundred English men and women who were done to death in the days of Queen Elizabeth on charge of treason for disagreeing in matters of religious with their monarch. This is the story of her life, her faith, and her execution. It affords an enlightening insight into the mentality of the Catholic dissenter of those days of religious ferment, when England was still trying to make up her mind in which direction she would go, back to Rome or out to lead the van of the opposition.

Dark Was the Wilderness, by P. W. O'Grady and Dorothy Dunn. Milwaukee. Bruce. 1945. pp. 278. \$2.00

An historical novel which is worked out against the exciting background of the Christianization of the Huron Indians in American colonial days. The principal characters are two Indian brothers, one of whom is staunchly loyal to his people's pagan past, the other accepts the Black Robes' way. Famous Black Robes of sainted memory appear in its cast of characters. The authors have drawn their historical material from the well-known *Jesuit Relations*. Two carefully prepared maps of the area for the story are of distinct historical value.

After Black Coffee, by Robert I. Gannon, S. J. New York. Declan X. McMullen. 1947. pp. 184. \$2.00

This volume contains a number of addresses, to varied audiences, delivered in late years by the President of Fordham University. Their historical value lies in the interpretation of trends and events of our times. This, however, is secondary to their interest and entertainment value.

Thinking It Over, by Thomas Woodlock. New York. Declan X. McMullen. 1947. pp. 292. \$3.00

For fifteen years, important years in our own and in world history, Thomas F. Woodlock contributed a daily column to the *Wall Street Journal*. Some of the most penetrating and perennially pertinent of these observations are herein gathered by James Edward Tobin and preserved for what should be a grateful posterity. The range is great, from "isms" through Law and Education to War and Peace.

The Story of Therese Neumann, by Albert Paul Schimberg. Milwaukee. Bruce. 1947. pp. 232. \$2.50

The present work, by the man who had previously made available to English-speaking audiences the studies of Friederich Ritter von Lama, official chronicler of the Konnersreuth phenomena, brings the story of Therese Neumann up to date. Mr. Schimberg fills in the gap in the story which developed during the war years. He has included many accounts from American G. I.'s and a number of photographs of the stigmatist and pertinent scenes from her Bavarian village. Her story continues to be an amazing and a fascinating one.

Wartime Correspondence Between President Roosevelt and Pope Pius XII, with an introduction and explanatory notes by Myron C. Taylor. New York. Macmillan. 1947. pp. xiii, 127. \$2.50

This is the record of a unique chapter in the history of the United States. It is gathered and superbly edited by the man who served as the intermediary between two of the great wartime statesmen. The correspondence gives a highly enlightening insight into the characters, aims, and ideals of the two correspondents. The introduction very clearly sets forth the background of and the position occupied by Mr. Taylor. The explanatory notes with which each of the ten groups of letters has been prefaced form an excellent short history of the war itself, while setting the stage for an understanding of the communications, and are exceptionally valuable. Mr. Taylor has rendered a real service to historians in this work.

Catholicism, by Gerald Groveland Walsh, S. J. New York. The Declan X. McMullen Company. 1947. pp. 94. \$1.25

Two thoughtful and provocative essays on the essence, meaning, and spirit of Catholic by the well-known editor of *Thought* are here reprinted, "Christ and the Church" and "The Church and Current Problems." To round out this excellent little book Father Walsh has added a valuable third section, "A Note on Further Reading," which brings to the attention of the reader and appraises for him a number of the best books on the Catholic Church.

The Book of Saints, compiled by the Benedictine Monks of St. Augustine's Abbey, Ramsgate. Fourth edition, revised and enlarged. New York. Macmillan. 1947. pp. 708. \$6.00

An excellent reference work rendered more serviceable by new additions and careful revisions. The original compilation drew certain criticisms in the past. These the present editors seek to overcome. Their work is in the best tradition of hagiographical scholarship. The inclusion of further bibliographical indications in the case of many of the saintly men and women noticed can be valuable to those who will need more information than can be packed into the limited space which restricted limits allow. The day-by-day calendar of saints, which had become a feature of the third edition, is a very useful feature. This work is highly recommended as a tool of quick reference for identification of saints' names and other basic information.

Our Lady of Fatima, by William Thomas Walsh. New York. Macmillan. 1947. pp. ix, 227. \$2.75

The notice which the apparitions of the Virgin in the Portuguese Serra da Aire, in 1917, have won in recent years has set the author-historian on the trail of investigation. Mr. Walsh, thanks to his long and fruitful acquaintance with things Iberian, might be considered an ideal reporter. He tells a simple and straightforward story, to date the best and most careful piece of reporting on the happenings of 1917 and their sequel.